

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Thesis
1969(F)
56

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TEACHER SATISFACTION IN TEAM AND
CONVENTIONAL TEACHING SITUATIONS

by

(C) NORMAN EMERSON DIEMERT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1969

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The purpose of this study was to determine if any significant

differences exist between the job satisfaction of teachers involved in

team teaching in team teaching schools and the job satisfaction of

teachers in conventional schools. Data were collected from Edmonton

junior high school teachers in both the Edmonton Public School District

and the Edmonton Separate School District. Six schools were selected as

Team and Conventional Teaching Situations," submitted

by Norman Emerson Diemert in partial fulfilment of the

chosen for comparative purposes.

requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Teachers in the twelve schools completed the Purdue Teacher

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if any significant differences exist between the job satisfaction of teachers involved in team teaching in team teaching schools and the job satisfaction of teachers in conventional schools. Data were collected from Edmonton junior high school teachers in both the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District. Six schools were selected as team teaching schools and an equal number of conventional schools was chosen for comparative purposes.

Teachers in the twelve schools completed the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire which was selected as a suitable instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction. Ten satisfaction factors are purported to be measured by this instrument: "Teacher Rapport with Principal", "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Rapport Among Teachers", "Teacher Salary", "Teacher Load", "Curriculum Issues", "Teacher Status", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services", and "Community Pressures." A total satisfaction score was obtained by summing the factor scores. Other data from the teachers were obtained from a personal and professional data questionnaire.

The mean satisfaction factor scores and the total satisfaction scores of the team teachers in the team teaching schools were compared with those of teachers from the conventional schools. The team teachers were found to have statistically significantly higher mean scores on the three factors of Curriculum Issues, Community Support of Education, and School Facilities and Services, and a significantly lower mean score on the one factor of Teacher Salary.

Length of experience in team teaching was found to correlate positively at the 0.05 level with Satisfaction with Teaching, Community Support of Education, School Facilities and Services, and the total satisfaction score. However, this finding should be viewed cautiously since a high proportion of the teachers had only a limited amount of experience in team teaching.

There was no evidence to suggest that the method by which the teachers became involved in team teaching was related to differences in the job satisfaction of the team teachers. No significant differences were found between the mean satisfaction scores and total satisfaction scores of teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and those of teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions without any choice in the matter.

The team teachers involved in this study expressed greater satisfaction on three of the ten factors which were measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Although this finding offers some support to the speculation that team teachers are more satisfied with their working situation than the conventional teachers, this study showed that the type of teaching situation does not appear to be a dominant variable in the determination of job satisfaction. The job satisfaction of teachers is affected by many variables, among which the type of teaching situation appears to be one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM	1
The Problem	3
Statement of the problem	3
Sub-problems	3
Definition of Terms	3
Other Variables	7
Hypotheses	7
Importance of the Study	9
Bibliography for Chapter I	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	13
Job Satisfaction	13
Factors affecting teacher job satisfaction	14
The relationship between job satisfaction and other factors	18
Team Teaching	21
Team teaching and teacher satisfaction.	22
Summary of Chapter II	25
Bibliography for Chapter II	27
III. INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY	29
Instrumentation	29
The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire	29
Teacher Questionnaire	30
Methodology	31
The sample	31
Collection and treatment of the data	32

CHAPTER	PAGE
Assumptions	34
Delimitations	34
Limitations	35
Summary of Chapter III	36
Bibliography for Chapter III	37
IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE	38
Characteristics of the Schools	38
Response to the Questionnaire	40
Characteristics of the Teachers	42
Personal variables	42
Professional variables	45
Data from the team teachers	48
Summary of Chapter IV.	53
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	55
Testing of the Hypotheses	56
Hypothesis 1.0	56
Hypotheses 1.1-1.10	56
Hypothesis 2.0	58
Hypothesis 3.0	60
Other Findings	60
Discussion of the Findings	70
Summary of the Findings	75
Bibliography for Chapter V	78
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	79
Summary of the Study	79
Summary of the Findings.	81

CHAPTER	PAGE
Conclusions.	82
Suggestions for Further Research	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDIX A.1	92
APPENDIX A.2	99
APPENDIX A.3	101
APPENDIX A.4	102
APPENDIX B	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Numbers of Pupils and Teachers in Each School	39
II. Numbers of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned	41
III. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Sex and Marital Status of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers in the Sample.	43
IV. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Ages of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers in the Sample. .	44
V. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Years of Teaching Experience and Post-Secondary Education of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers in the Sample . . .	46
VI. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers in the Sample by Subject Area in Which the Majority of Their Teaching Time Was Spent.	47
VII. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Years of Experience in Team Teaching of Team Teachers in the Sample.	49
VIII. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Responses to Items Describing Initial Enthusiasm and Present Enthusiasm of Team Teachers Toward Their Involvement in Team Teaching.	50
IX. Frequency and Percentage Frequency Distributions of Team Teachers Who Chose to Become Involved in Team Teaching and Those Who Were Assigned to Team Teaching Without Any Choice	51

TABLE	PAGE
X. Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers	57
XI. Correlation Coefficients Between Length of Experience in Team Teaching and Satisfaction of Team Teachers	59
XII. Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of Team Teachers Who Chose to Become Involved in Team Teaching and Those Who Were Given No Choice Regarding Their Involvement	61
XIII. Mean Age, Mean Years of Teaching Experience, and Mean Years of Post-Secondary Education of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers in the Sample	62
XIV. Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of Male and Female Teachers According to the Teaching Situation	64
XV. Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers According to Sex	65
XVI. Correlation Coefficients Between Job Satisfaction and Age, Years of Teaching Experience, and Years of Post- Secondary Education of Team Teachers and Conventional Teachers	66
XVII. Number of Years of Teaching Experience (Total and Team Teaching) of Team Teachers Who Chose to Become Involved in Team Teaching and Team Teachers Who Were Assigned to Their Positions	68

TABLE	
XVIII.	The Enthusiasm (Initial and Present) of Team Teachers Who Chose to Become Involved in Team Teaching and Team Teachers Who Were Assigned to Their Positions 69
XIX.	Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of the Teachers According to School. 71
XX.	Mean Satisfaction Factor Scores and Total Satisfaction Scores of Team Teachers With One and Two Years of Team Teaching Experience and Team Teachers With Three to Five Years of Team Teaching Experience. 76

CHAPTER I

DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

Teachers possibly more than any other occupational group need an organization in which and through which they can derive satisfaction in fulfilling the expectations which are held for them. Griffiths claims that "in many respects, teaching is the least satisfying of all the professions because it is so difficult to see the results of one's labors." (13:146) Consequently, the development of morale in a school staff is one aspect of the administrative process which requires the close attention of the school principal. It is largely through his efforts that teachers are able to achieve satisfaction in their work.

Team teaching, a relatively new pattern of school organization, has been claimed by many writers to provide a means through which teachers can derive a great deal more job satisfaction. This increased satisfaction results primarily from staff members working in much closer association than was the case in the more conventional teaching situation. This observation is made by Bair and Woodward (3:213), Dean (14:215), Feldvebel (8:47), and Polos (19:79), and is illustrated in the following quotation from Beggs:

Team teaching can give the individual teacher increased professional stimulation and satisfaction as a result of contacts with colleagues about ideas, methods of instruction and students. Such stimulation and satisfaction is a morale booster. The exchange of ideas with another teacher and the feeling of accomplishment when a teacher verifies a contention with another teacher builds a sense of well-being and satisfaction. (4:46)

However, factors other than the "team-work" have also been claimed to contribute to increased satisfaction through team teaching. Bair and Woodward contend that the increased recognition of individual

skills and talents and the opportunity to know the pupils better are contributing factors. (3:213) Bischoff and Enns observed an increase of the team members' prestige in the eyes of other teachers in the community. (5:4) Dean refers to better communication and increased motivation and cooperation in team teaching. (14:215)

It should be noted that not all writers are so optimistic about the beneficial effects of team teaching on teachers' morale. Team teaching may produce lower staff morale as a result of the conflicts that can arise between team teachers and the members of the instructional staffs who are not team teaching. Meyer's description of his experience with team teaching (17:362-364), for example, illustrates that a measure of jealousy and envy is often directed towards the team teaching program by teachers involved in the more conventional teaching situation. Team teachers are criticised for keeping to themselves as a group and consequently communicating less with other staff members. As a result of the time and effort of administrators spent assisting teaching teams, some teachers feel that there is greater favoritism displayed toward teaching teams in contrast with teachers not participating in team teaching.

Beggs claims that the possibility of morale problems is also very evident in team situations utilizing teachers who were formerly involved in the more conventional situation.

Teachers must become accustomed to working in concert with another or others. . . . Somehow the self-contained classroom has insulated many teachers from the energy created when professionals talk about ideas in their field. . . . For some teachers it is disarming to confront disagreement and differing views. (4:45)

Lust points out the importance of careful selection of staff for a team teaching situation:

It should be emphasized that teachers must be very carefully selected for an "open-area" team teaching organization; otherwise, the disunity that may result could spell failure to this teaching method. Team teachers must be able to "give and take" in a constructive manner because of the close association and cooperation with colleagues and auxiliary personnel so necessary to this method of teaching. (16:36-37)

Consequently, although increased job satisfaction is one of the most strongly contended advantages of team teaching, claims are also put forth that team teaching can be detrimental to the job satisfaction of teachers.

The Problem

Statement of the problem. Are there significant differences between the job satisfaction of teachers involved in team teaching in team teaching schools and that of teachers in conventional schools?

Since the prime purpose for undertaking this study was to provide information about job satisfaction in a team teaching situation, two sub-problems were formulated which relate specifically to the job satisfaction of team teachers.

Sub-problems. (1) Does a significant relationship exist between the job satisfaction of teachers involved in team teaching and the length of experience in team teaching?

(2) Does a significant relationship exist between the job satisfaction of teachers involved in team teaching and the manner in which they became involved in team teaching?

Definition of Terms

Two terms, job satisfaction and team teaching, are central to the basic problem investigated in this thesis. Since both terms are

complex and susceptible to a variety of connotations, a discussion and a general definition of each are provided. In addition, team teaching, job satisfaction, and other associated terms are defined operationally for the sake of clarity.

Morale and job satisfaction--general definition. A great deal of confusion and difficulty is evident in the literature when writers attempt to arrive at some general definition of morale or job satisfaction. Smith indicates that there is a difference between the two terms: "Morale is dynamic and forward-looking, steadfast in the face of difficulty, whereas job satisfaction is a more static, shallow concept." (22:144) Dubin defines morale as ". . . the zeal with which an activity is carried out. The higher the morale, the greater is the zeal displayed by the people engaged in an activity." (7:217) Job satisfaction he defines simply as ". . . satisfaction people get from their tasks." (7:242) Gordon distinguishes between the terms as follows:

Job satisfaction is commonly used to refer to the reactions of individuals to specific elements in their working environment, whereas morale often is applied to the general level of satisfaction and enthusiasm of individuals and groups. (12:387)

Instead of attempting to distinguish between morale and satisfaction, many writers either equate or note the equation of the two terms. This point of view has been taken by Rempel and Bentley (20:1), Johnson (15:4), Yuzuk (23:iii), and Feldvebel (8:44). Blocker and Richardson, in attempting to provide a critical review of morale research, noted the futility of attempting to divide studies dealing with morale and job satisfaction into two distinct categories: "Any division of studies into these two categories is bound to be arbitrary and to contain a considerable amount of overlapping." (6:200)

Consequently, the following conclusion of Gill and Johnson was accepted: ". . . the term morale defies definition in any absolute sense. The most useful definitions are operational . . ." (10:11) The general definition used in Johnson's thesis seemed to be suitable for this study.

For the purpose of this study the term "morale" will be used as the equivalent of "job satisfaction". . . . According to this approach a person or group of persons who express a high degree of satisfaction with various aspects of their work situation are said to have high morale and conversely those who express dissatisfaction are said to have low morale. (15:4)

Since job satisfaction and morale are to be considered as equivalent, the terms "morale factors" and "total morale" which are used in the description of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (20:1-2) are referred to in this thesis as "satisfaction factors" and "total satisfaction."

Job satisfaction--operational definition. The attitudes to various aspects of the work situation as expressed in responses to the items on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, and as measured by the total satisfaction score and the satisfaction factor scores on that instrument.

Satisfaction factors. The ten factors identified and described by the authors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire; each factor purports to be a description of a dimension of teacher job satisfaction.

Total satisfaction. A global measure of job satisfaction arrived at by summing the scores achieved on the ten satisfaction factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

Team teaching--general definition. As much confusion surrounds a definition of team teaching as morale and job satisfaction. This

seems to have resulted from the fact that as schools accepted the concept of team teaching they adapted it to suit their own environment. Nystrand and Bertolaet, for example, claim that ". . . there are almost as many operational definitions of team teaching as there are schools employing the practice." (18:454) In his review of the research on team teaching Anderson writes: "The term team teaching continued to be applied rather loosely to a wide variety of arrangements involving cooperation and collaboration among teachers." (1:456)

Although some authors tend to apply rather rigid and precise definitions to the term, others who have written extensively in the field, such as Goodlad (11:11), Shaplin (21:16), Beggs (4:16), and Anderson (2:83), have used definitions which are much more flexible so that they can be applied to most, if not all, projects designated as "team teaching." It should be noted too that the term is often used synonymously with "cooperative teaching."

Anderson's general definition of team teaching seemed to be most suitable for this study.

Team teaching is a formal type of cooperative staff organization in which a group of teachers accepts the responsibility for planning, carrying out, and evaluating an educational program, or some major portion of a program, for an aggregate of pupils. (2:83)

Team teaching--operational definition. A teaching approach in which the learning experiences of a group of students are planned, presented, and evaluated collectively by a group of teachers.

Team teaching schools. Those schools which, according to the selection procedure described in Chapter III, are engaged in team teaching as defined above.

Conventional schools. Those schools which, according to the selection procedure described in Chapter III, are not involved in team teaching.

Team teachers. Teachers involved in team teaching in the team teaching schools.

Conventional teachers. Teachers in the conventional schools.

Other Variables

In addition to job satisfaction and the teaching situation (team teaching and conventional), there are other variables related to the problems of the study. All teachers responding to the questionnaire (Appendix A.2) were asked to indicate their age, years of teaching experience, and years of post-secondary training by marking the appropriate responses. The teachers involved in team teaching were, in addition, required to indicate the length of their experience in team teaching, the manner in which they became involved, and their initial and present enthusiasm toward being involved in a team teaching situation. An open-ended "free response" section also was provided for the respondents so that they could briefly outline the events which led up to their appointment in a team teaching situation.

Hypotheses

This study was to a considerable extent exploratory. Although much of the research and learned opinion suggests a positive relationship between teacher satisfaction and team teaching, no research was encountered which was directly related to teacher satisfaction in team teaching schools. Therefore, directional hypotheses did not seem

appropriate and null hypotheses were formulated for the investigation. The hypotheses and related analyses were tested for significance at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 1.0 The mean total satisfaction score of teachers involved in team teaching in the team teaching schools is not significantly different from the mean total satisfaction score of teachers in the conventional schools.

Hypothesis 1.1 The mean "Rapport with the Principal" score of teachers involved in team teaching in the team teaching schools is not significantly different from that of the teachers in the conventional schools.

The following hypotheses (1.2 to 1.10) are similar to hypothesis 1.1 except that the factor, "Rapport with the Principal", is replaced respectively by the following factors:

Hypothesis 1.2 "Satisfaction with Teaching"

Hypothesis 1.3 "Rapport Among Teachers"

Hypothesis 1.4 "Teacher Salary"

Hypothesis 1.5 "Teacher Load"

Hypothesis 1.6 "Curriculum Issues"

Hypothesis 1.7 "Teacher Status"

Hypothesis 1.8 "Community Support of Education"

Hypothesis 1.9 "School Facilities and Services"

Hypothesis 1.10 "Community Pressures"

Hypotheses 2.0 and 3.0 stemmed from the sub-problems and were designed to provide information relevant to the job satisfaction of only the team teachers.

Measures of job satisfaction in hypotheses 2.0 and 3.0 involve all of the ten satisfaction factor scores referred to in Hypotheses 1.1 to 1.10 as well as the total satisfaction score referred to in Hypothesis 1.0.

Hypothesis 2.0 There is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction of team teachers and the number of years that they have been involved in team teaching.

Hypothesis 3.0 The mean satisfaction factor scores and the mean total satisfaction score of the teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching are not significantly different from those of the teachers who were assigned to team teaching positions.

Importance of the Study

Team teaching has rapidly assumed the dimensions of a major educational movement in Canada. In Edmonton, for example, all of the newer schools, in both the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District, have features built into them which will facilitate team teaching, and new additions to existing schools also have large teaching areas and small conference rooms included in their design. Administrators are encouraging team teaching, even in schools which do not have appropriate physical facilities. A commitment to this form of school organization appears to exist in both the public and separate school systems in Edmonton.

Such a dramatic change in school organization has definite effects on the interpersonal relationships among teachers. This is especially true of team teaching since teachers are expected to work together "as a team" and are thereby compelled to work cooperatively

with their colleagues and fulfill their share of the responsibilities. Furthermore, their teaching ability is now, more than ever before, open to the close scrutiny of their peers.

This manifests a number of implications for school administrators since they contribute a great deal to establishing morale in the schools. One of the reasons why principals are turning to a team approach in teaching may be because it has been claimed to produce greater job satisfaction among teachers. Since there has apparently been no research evidence to substantiate this claim, it was hoped that this investigation would point out differences that exist in the job satisfaction of teachers in team and conventional teaching situations, so that principals and teachers contemplating the adoption of team teaching could have additional evidence upon which to base their decision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTER I

1. Anderson, Robert H. "Organizational Character of Education: Staff Utilization and Deployment," Review of Educational Research, 34:455-469, October, 1964.
2. _____. Teaching in a World of Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.
3. Bair, Medill, and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.
4. Beggs, David W. (ed.). Team Teaching. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
5. Bischoff, F. X., and F. Enns. "A Team Teaching Project," The Canadian Administrator, 7:1-4, October, 1967.
6. Blocker, Clyde E., and Richard C. Richardson. "Twenty-Five Years of Morale Research: A Critical Review," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36:200-210, January, 1963.
7. Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
8. Feldvebel, A. M. "Teacher Satisfaction," Clearing House, 43:44-48, September, 1968.
9. Gill, N., and B. K. Johnson. "Morale--Part I," The CSA Bulletin, 6:3-24, May, 1967.
10. _____. "Morale--Part II," The CSA Bulletin, 6:3-22, June, 1967.
11. Goodlad, John I. "Cooperative Teaching in Educational Reform," The National Elementary Principal, 44:9-13, January, 1965.
12. Gordon, Garford G. "Conditions of Employment and Service in Elementary and Secondary Schools: Teacher Morale and Job Satisfaction," Review of Educational Research, 33:387-388, October, 1963.
13. Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.
14. Hillson, Maurie (ed.). Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
15. Johnson, B. K. "An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

16. Lust, A. "McKee School: An Experiment in Instructional Improvement," The CSA Bulletin, 7:15-37, June, 1968.
17. Meyer, James A. "Group Grope: Problems of Team Teaching," Clearing House, 42:362-364, February, 1968.
18. Nystrand, Raphael O., and Frederick Bertolaet. "Strategies for Allocating Human and Material Resources," Review of Educational Research, 37:448-468, October, 1967.
19. Polos, Nicholas C. The Dynamics of Team Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1965.
20. Rempel, Averno, and Ralph R. Bentley. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. West Lafayette: University Book Store, 1967.
21. Shaplin, Judson T. "Cooperative Teaching: Definitions and Organizational Analysis," The National Elementary Principal, 44:9-13, January, 1965.
22. Smith, D. R. "A Proposed Model for the Investigation of Teacher Morale," The Journal of Educational Administration, 4:143-148, October, 1966.
23. Yuzuk, Ronald P. The Assessment of Employee Morale, Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1961.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Since this research project was primarily concerned with comparing teacher satisfaction in team and conventional teaching situations, a review of research dealing with both teacher satisfaction in general and teacher satisfaction in team teaching situations in particular was pertinent to this study.

The review of related research is organized into three general areas of study:

- (1) identification of factors that affect the morale or job satisfaction of teachers;
- (2) examination of the relationship between morale or job satisfaction and other factors in the teaching situation; and
- (3) examination of the morale or job satisfaction of teachers in team teaching situations.

Job Satisfaction

The study of job satisfaction in schools began soon after World War II. A great deal of interest had been generated by the publication of surveys of job satisfaction in industrial settings and this turned the attention of educators to the question of teacher job satisfaction. Studies of teacher job satisfaction which resulted are reviewed in this thesis.

The reviews of research in studies by Keeler (19:16-26), Okonkwo (22:12-32), and Johnson (17:1-3,8-12,21-22) have covered the topic quite thoroughly. Therefore, the intent of this review is to present a framework of research in teacher job satisfaction, highlight

some of the more notable studies, and update the reviews presented in the aforementioned studies.

Factors affecting teacher job satisfaction. Research in teacher job satisfaction can basically be placed in one of two categories: (1) the search for factors that affect teacher job satisfaction in general, and (2) the investigation of the relationship between job satisfaction and other factors which contribute to the organizational climate.

One of the earliest studies which attempted to identify the factors which affect teacher job satisfaction was carried out by Hedlund and Brown in 1948. (14:40-42) Reactions to seventy-five specific living and working conditions were requested from 3,000 teachers in 117 schools in New York State. The causes of dissatisfaction in teaching were grouped into four categories: salary conditions (insufficient to live as well as others carrying similar responsibilities, men more dissatisfied than women), teaching conditions (no relief from pupil contact, classes too large, teaching too tiring), community conditions (lack of transportation and community support), and administrative conditions (lack of opportunities for advancement, lack of feedback on the quality of work, unsatisfactory support with discipline problems).

Hunter, in his study of teacher attitudes (16:345-352), sent questionnaires to all teachers in the New Orleans public schools in 1950, 1953, and 1956. Since the results were obtained from "yes" and "no" responses to statements regarding the school and living-working conditions, the findings are reported in terms of percentage of responses reacting favorably toward the specific items. Most of the respondents indicated that causes for dissatisfaction were found in the following areas:

handling atypical pupils and discipline problems, the teaching load, salary, recognition and reward for exceptional service, having work properly evaluated, and advancement and promotion on merit. Hunter noted areas of improvement from one survey to the next and concluded that periodic attitude surveys stimulated morale in that teachers are led to believe that somebody is interested enough to try to find out how they feel.

A more extensive survey to discover the factors that affect teacher morale was carried out by staff of the George Peabody College for Teachers and was reported by Harap. (12:55-57) Responses were obtained from teachers in twenty school systems between the years 1949 and 1957. The commonest causes of poor morale that were identified were: inadequate salaries, large classes, poor administration, lack of daily rest periods, unsatisfactory plant and buildings, and a lack of teaching materials and equipment. A good salary scale and reasonably small classes were found to be the next most potent factors creating teachers' satisfactions. From an analysis of sub-groups among teachers, Harap noted that morale was slightly higher among teachers in the elementary schools than it was among teachers in the high schools. He further concluded that administrators tended to overestimate the degree of morale in their schools.

In 1955 a research project, involving twenty-four school systems and 5,000 teachers, was undertaken by Redefer and a group of graduate students of New York University. (23:59-62) He reported that teacher job satisfaction was affected by teachers' efficiency and the quality of their teaching, teacher-community relations, a sense of participation, relations with the school board, the administration within the school,

the adequacy of communication in the school system, and the recognition of effort. Age, sex, marital status, and merit increments were variables noted as not having an effect on job satisfaction. (24:5-7)

Chase reported contradictory findings (7:127-132) in a study which involved returns from 1,784 teachers in over 200 school systems in forty-three states. Personal variables, such as those reported by Redefer, were found to relate to teacher satisfaction. Higher satisfaction was expressed by elementary teachers, women, more experienced teachers, higher paid teachers, and teachers rated as more enthusiastic by their superintendent. Other features of the working situation which were found to produce greater satisfaction were the freedom to plan work, a high quality of professional leadership and supervision, participation in educational planning and policy making, and good working conditions.

A study on a much smaller scale was conducted by McLaughlin and Shea (21:216-224) in seventeen elementary schools and ten secondary schools in California. Teachers were asked to list all items of dissatisfaction which they considered hindrances in performing their daily tasks, to note the most annoying, and to comment freely.

Items of dissatisfaction reported in order of frequency were as follows: excessive clerical work, inadequate salary, supervisory duties at school, negative student attitude toward learning, extra functions after school, over-enrollment of classes, inadequate equipment and facilities, faculty teacher-administrator relationships, ineffective school disciplinary policies, the presence of behavior problems in most classrooms, and impolite student reaction to teacher leadership. (21:217)

More recent research in teacher job satisfaction was conducted by Sergiovanni in Monroe County, New York. (27:66-82) The results of his study indicate that achievement, recognition, and responsibility were factors which contributed predominantly to teacher job satisfaction.

Interpersonal relations with subordinates (students) and peers, supervision, school policy and administration, personal life, and fairness-unfairness were factors which contributed predominantly to teacher job dissatisfaction. The remaining factors appeared to be bipolar, possessing the potential to contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The satisfiers and dissatisfiers which were identified tended to be mutually exclusive, that is, some factors were satisfiers when present but not dissatisfiers when absent; other factors were dissatisfiers, but when eliminated as dissatisfiers did not result in positive motivation. Sergiovanni concluded from these findings that satisfaction factors of teachers were related to the work itself whereas factors which were dissatisfiers related to the conditions or environment of work.

In 1967 Adair also conducted a study in New York State with a similar design and purpose: ". . . to identify those factors in the job of a teacher which lead to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction."

(1:28) His results confirmed Sergiovanni's findings in that he also found that the job factors which serve to motivate the individual are different factors entirely from those that produce dissatisfaction. Those aspects of the teaching situation which act as satisfiers were found to be intrinsic with the task of teaching. The greatest amount of dissatisfaction results from the extrinsic job factors.

The final study to be discussed in this section was carried out by Rempel and Bentley. Although their main purpose was to develop an instrument which would measure teacher morale, they did identify factors which affect teacher morale. In the original instrument, 145 items were chosen as a result of internal consistency item analysis techniques.

(25:223-240) Through a factor analysis, eight factors or dimensions of morale were identified. As a result of further testing and refinement (26:3-4), the original 145 items were reduced to 100 and ten factors were identified: teacher rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among the teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures. The revised version of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was administered to a sample of 3,023 high school teachers in Indiana and Oregon. Reliability was determined from a test/re-test of the instrument. The correlations reported were all above .60 and most were .80 or greater. The validity of the earlier form of the instrument was determined by both "expert judgement" and "peer selection" techniques. Since there was a strong relationship between the expert judgement criterion and the peer selection (25:240), the instrument was concluded to have validity as an indicator of teacher morale.

The relationship between job satisfaction and other factors.

Besides attempting to identify the factors which affect teacher job satisfaction, writers in this area of educational research have also related job satisfaction to other factors in the organizational climate. Keeler's review of research, for example, illustrates studies which have focused on the relationship between morale and productivity (19:16-21) and between morale and leader behavior (19:21-26). He notes contradictory findings from research studying the relationship between morale and productivity. Anderson found significant differences in morale between schools with high student achievement and schools with low student achievement whereas Congreve's results indicated that no

relationship existed between morale and achievement.

Keeler points out that much of the research on teacher morale has been related to the leader behavior of the administrators. The studies which he cites as examples of this research indicate that such a relationship does exist.

Okonkwo's review of related literature (22:12-32) illustrates research which has dealt with the relationship of teacher satisfaction and the various factors included in his questionnaire: administrative factors, working conditions, pupil factors and work load, church factors, and personal factors. He summarizes this review as follows:

Administrative-teacher communication, human relations and participation by teachers in policy making were found to be the main causes of dissatisfaction in administrative factors. Day-to-day personnel practices were perceived by teachers as crucial in their satisfaction with working conditions. Matters of pupil discipline and over-enrollment affected satisfaction and in church systems lack of promotional opportunities caused dissatisfaction among teachers. (22:31-32)

A recent study by Johnson includes a review of research pertaining to the relationship between job satisfaction and the socio-economic status of schools. (17:8-12) He notes that although most of the research indicates that teachers in low status schools are less satisfied with their work situation and have lower morale than their counterparts in more affluent areas, there is also some evidence to the contrary. Some teachers find definite satisfaction in teaching the underprivileged. (17:13) Johnson's own study, for example, did not reveal any significant difference on the total morale scores of teachers from high status schools compared to teachers from low status schools. He did find, however, that teachers in the low status schools had statistically significant lower mean scores on three of the ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (Teacher Salary, Curriculum Issues,

and Community Support of Education); and a significantly higher mean score on one factor (Rapport with the Principal). (17:iii)

Perhaps of even more significance to this study, however, is the fact that Johnson, in illustrating the validity of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, outlined a number of studies which have isolated the relationship of teacher job satisfaction to the various factors in the instrument. (17:21-22)

Another recent study utilizing the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was conducted by Collins in an Indiana high school. (9:3-10) It was stimulated by the rivalry between union (AFT) teachers and non-union (NEA) teachers and the speculation that a growing militancy among teachers was affecting morale. The results revealed that non-union teachers had significantly higher morale for the status and salary factors and for total morale. Other significant interactions revealed that younger, lower salaried, non-tenure, lesser-experienced union teachers had higher morale than older, higher salaried, most-experienced union teachers while the opposite was found for non-union teachers.

The final study to be discussed in this section was reported by Blumberg and Weber in November, 1968. (5:109-113) This study focused on the possible relationship that might develop between the manner in which a teacher perceives his supervisor's behavior and teacher job satisfaction. The job satisfaction of 210 teachers enrolled in graduate courses in Temple University was measured using an incomplete sentence test, and the supervisor's behavior was described in terms of an adaptation of Flanders' direct-indirect categories. The results indicated significant differences in satisfaction scores related to differential perceptions of supervisory behavioral styles. Differences in teacher

satisfaction scores seemed to be related to the amount of emphasis that teachers see their supervisors putting on indirect behavior in supervisory interaction. Such behavior is defined as concern for the teacher as a person and a concern for collaborative problem solving.

Team Teaching

Although the concept of team teaching has been on the educational scene since the mid-fifties, very little research evidence has emerged on this pattern of school organization. Furthermore, nearly all the "research" that has accompanied the team teaching movement has been descriptive and subjective. Joyce claims that this could probably have been expected, however, since ". . . the people who have conducted such studies were concerned with bringing about an innovation and either guarding against gross damage to children or fending off critics." (18:325)

Heathers (13:27-33), in his review of research on cooperative teaching, notes that practically all studies can be placed in one of four categories: pupil achievement, pupil adjustment, parental attitudes, and teachers' attitudes. He observes that most studies have dealt with pupil achievement and usually indicate that scores on standardized tests are about the same with cooperative teaching as with the self-contained classroom. Studies dealing with pupil adjustment have indicated no evidence of any harmful effects with cooperative teaching; some indicate that cooperative teaching promotes personal-social development. Other research studies have shown that the majority of parents hold favorable attitudes towards cooperative teaching. Similarly, the few findings that have reported teachers' attitudes suggest that they have reacted favorably toward cooperative teaching. Regarding the research on teachers'

attitudes, Heathers writes:

It is evident that the attitudes of teachers toward cooperative teaching are decisive factors in its present success and its future use in America's schools. In the light of this fact, it is remarkable how few of the research studies have obtained specific information about teachers' attitudes. (13:31)

Other writers such as Carlin (6:348-353), Joyce (18:323-337), and Drummond (15:220-226) present views which tend to agree with Heathers' assessment of team teaching research. They note a lack of research on team teaching and an emphasis on the assessment of pupil achievement. Carlin points out a need for research in such areas as teacher satisfaction, teacher education and in-service effectiveness, all of which seem to be considerably enhanced in team teaching. (6:349) Joyce also notes that some of the important first questions in the study of team-teaching have not been studied carefully. One area that he mentions is teacher morale: "Theoretically, a team of people working together should be able to create a quite potent social climate. How can this be done?" (18:328)

Team teaching and teacher satisfaction. As indicated by the above writers, and confirmed by a search of the literature, there has apparently been no research done on teacher satisfaction in team teaching schools. The only literature available that bears any association with satisfaction in team teaching comes from subjective reports on various team teaching projects, and surveys of attitudes toward team teaching.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) was the organization from which the idea of a team function in teaching emerged. Aided by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a commission appointed by the NASSP supervised experiments in junior and senior high schools across the United States.

The reports from these experiments contain insights into teacher satisfaction in team teaching.

The report on the University of Chicago Laboratory School project (11:189-197), for example, indicates that although the team began the project in "high spirits", several factors operated to diminish the high morale. One factor they noted in particular was that there perhaps was "too much togetherness." (11:194) On the other hand, Clawson describes quite different results in an Illinois high school.

It would seem definitely established that teachers gain enthusiasm for working closely together on a team, and are given a better opportunity to benefit from the close association such an arrangement provides. (8:96)

A similar report is given on the morale of the teachers involved in a project in San Diego, California.

Basic to the success of this project were the classroom teachers. Working as a team stimulated the teachers to give extra time and effort to their instructional responsibilities. They were willing to try out new ideas and new approaches to teaching. They were not discouraged if some of their ideas did not succeed as well as they had hoped. (4:166)

Mason (20:363-365), describing a project in Connecticut which was not part of the NASSP study, indicates that teacher morale seems to be extremely high among team teachers. He further reports that morale of students also improves, that they adjust well to new methods, that they are stimulated to further study, and that they appreciate meeting different teachers.

Information gathered from the Claremont, California project was compiled by Douglass. In discussing the effect of team teaching on the teachers' attitudes he wrote the following:

When teachers who are participating in team teaching are asked what they consider the most important effects of team teaching on

various key aspects of the school curriculum, their comments are consistently positive. The one area most considerably affected, however, has been the teacher's own pleasure and satisfaction in teaching. The impact upon curriculum development, guidance functions, student motivation, etc., while positive, is not as important an effect in their minds. (15:233)

A study conducted in Edmonton by Bischoff (2:1-4) was designed to measure pupil achievement in team teaching and conventional situations, but revealed factors other than achievement which developed during the project. Growth in professionalism was indicated by more frequent consultation with professional periodicals, colleagues, and university staff. Teaching methods became more diversified, curricula were analyzed and modified, and the prestige of the team teachers rose. The net result noted by Bischoff was "a dynamic improvement in staff morale." (3:4)

Davis' study (10:38-39) involved interviews with seventy-two team teachers in fifteen public secondary schools in the northeastern United States. He reported that although the teachers' attitudes were generally favorable, the poorest attitudes toward team teaching were exhibited by those teachers who were forced into the program with no real understanding as to its purpose. These teachers were seen to resent the loss of their identity as the teacher in a designated classroom.

In a study carried out by the Canadian Education Association in 1964 (28:3-16), information was gathered on twenty-four schools across Canada which were engaged in team teaching. The respondents were asked to comment briefly on the progress of their trials with team teaching under three headings: best features, worst features, and factors that seemed to be essential for successful team teaching work. One of the three best features was staff morale. It was felt that (a) teachers grow

professionally in their team meetings, (b) there is obvious benefit to staff members because of cooperation, and (c) the repetition of lessons is eliminated. (28:14)

Summary of Chapter II

The first group of studies reviewed in this chapter were studies which attempted to identify the factors which affect teacher job satisfaction. An examination of these studies revealed eight factors which were commonly identified. Five of the eight factors appeared in most of the studies: (1) teacher-administrator relationships, (2) satisfaction with teaching, (3) teacher load, (4) teacher salary, and (5) school facilities and services. The three remaining factors were identified in more than one of the studies but did not appear in as many studies as the five previously mentioned factors. The three factors were: (1) relationships among the faculty members, (2) teacher-community relationships, and (3) adequacy of the curriculum.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, which was used to measure teacher satisfaction in this study, contains all eight of the factors mentioned above. In addition, it includes "teacher status" and "community pressures" to comprise a total of ten factors in the instrument.

Studies were also reviewed which examined the relationship between teacher morale or satisfaction and other factors in the teaching situation. Some of these "other factors" encountered in the literature were pupil achievement, leader behavior, socio-economic status of the schools, and union membership.

Although no studies were encountered which directly examined the relationship between teacher satisfaction in team teaching as

compared with conventional teaching situations, a search of the literature did reveal some studies which dealt with the relationship in part. This last group of studies reviewed in this chapter generally indicate that teacher satisfaction is enhanced in a team teaching situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTER II

1. Adair, J. Warren. "Keeping Teachers Happy," The American School Board Journal, 155:28-29, January, 1968.
2. Bischoff, Francis X. "An Evaluation of a Team Teaching Project." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.
3. _____, and F. Enns. "A Team Teaching Project," The Canadian Administrator, 7:1-4, October, 1967.
4. Bloomenshine, L. L., and T. Malcomb Brown. "San Diego, California Conducts a Two Year Experiment with Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:147-166, January, 1961.
5. Blumberg, Arthur, and Wilford A. Weber. "Teacher Morale as a Function of Perceived Supervisory Behavioral Style," The Journal of Educational Research, 62:109-113, November, 1968.
6. Carlin, Philip M. "A Current Appraisal of Team Teaching," Education, 85:348-353, February, 1965.
7. Chase, Francis S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," The Phi Delta Kappan. 33:127-132, November, 1951.
8. Clawson, H. A. "Maltoom, Illinois High School Tries Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:93-99, January, 1961.
9. Collins, Harold W., and Norbert J. Nelson. "A Study of Teacher Morale--Union (AFT) Teachers versus Non-Union (NEA) Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, 62:3-10, September, 1968.
10. Davis, Russell C. "Teacher Assessment of Team Teaching," Science Teacher, 33:38-39, December, 1966.
11. Hanvey, Robert, and Morton S. Tenenberg. "University of Chicago Laboratory School, Chicago, Illinois, Evaluates Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:189-197, January, 1961.
12. Harap, Henry. "Morale," Nation's Schools, 63:55-57, June, 1959.
13. Heathers, Glen. "Research on Implementing and Evaluating Cooperative Teaching," The National Elementary Principal, 44:27-33, January, 1965.
14. Hedlund, Paul A., and Foster S. Brown. "Conditions That Lower Teacher Morale," Nation's Schools, 48:40-42, September, 1951.
15. Hillson, Maurie (ed.). Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

16. Hunter, E. C. "Attitudes and Professional Relationships of Teachers: A Study of Teacher Morale," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:345-352, June, 1955.
17. Johnson, B. K. "An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.
18. Joyce, Bruce R. "Staff Utilization," Review of Educational Research, 37:323-337, June, 1967.
19. Keeler, Bernard T. "Dimensions of the Leader Behavior of Principals, Staff Morale and Productivity." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.
20. Mason, H. et al. "A Report on Team Teaching Adapted to a Standard Secondary School Curriculum," American Biology Teacher, 26:363-365, February, 1964.
21. McLaughlin, Jack W., and John T. Shea. "California Teachers' Job Dissatisfaction," California Journal of Educational Research, 11:216-224, November, 1960.
22. Okonkwo, A. E. N. "A Study of Teachers' Attitudes and Their Relation to Work Satisfaction." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.
23. Redefer, Frederick L. "Factors That Affect Teacher Morale," Nation's Schools, 63:59-62, February, 1959.
24. _____. "The School Board and Teacher Morale," The American School Board Journal, 145:5-7, July, 1962.
25. Rempel, Averno, and Ralph R. Bentley. "Peer Selection vs. Expert Judgement as a Means of Validating a Teacher Morale Instrument," Journal of Experimental Education, 31:223-240, March, 1963.
26. _____. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette: The University Bookstore, 1967.
27. Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," The Journal of Educational Administration, 5:66-82, May, 1967.
28. Team Teaching in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Education Association Research and Information Division, 1964. ✓

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

This study compared the job satisfaction of team teachers and conventional teachers. Chapter III contains a description of the instruments and research procedures used in making this comparison.

Instrumentation

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. The instrument used to measure teacher satisfaction was the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. The first form of the opinionnaire was developed in 1961 and contained 145 items purporting to measure various dimensions of teacher morale. As a result of factor analysis 100 items and ten factors were isolated in the final form of the instrument. The ten factors of the opinionnaire are defined by the authors as follows:

Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal" deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal -- his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

Factor 2 - "Satisfaction with Teaching" pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers" focuses on a teacher's relationships with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation, preparation, ethics, influence, interest, and competency of his peers.

Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary" pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?

Factor 5 - "Teacher Load" deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues" solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

Factor 7 - "Teacher Status" samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education" deals with the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services" has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10 - "Community Pressures" gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.
(3:4)

The particular items which appear in each of the ten factors are indicated in Appendix A.1.

This opinionnaire was used by Johnson in his study of the relationships between teacher satisfaction and the socio-economic status of schools. In his thesis he relates the basis upon which the authors of the instrument claimed for it considerable reliability (2:19-20) and validity (2:20). In addition to the evidence provided by the authors, Johnson cites a variety of studies which have identified satisfaction factors similar to those in the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.
(2:21)

Teacher Questionnaire. The Teacher Questionnaire (Appendix A.2) was prepared so that personal and professional data could be obtained

from the respondents. The first section of the questionnaire contained six items designed to provide an indication of the age, marital status, years of teaching experience, years of post-secondary training, and main teaching subject area of the teachers. The second section included the following variables which were related only to the team teachers in the sample: years of team teaching experience, method of involvement in team teaching, and enthusiasm toward team teaching.

Methodology

The sample. The study was conducted in selected junior high schools of the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District. All junior high school teachers involved in team teaching in schools designated as team teaching schools and the junior high school teachers in the same number of schools designated as conventional schools were included in the sample.

In order to select the team teaching schools, the appropriate central office staff member in each system was contacted and asked to identify the junior high schools in which team teaching was being carried out. Seven such schools were identified in the public system and four in the separate system. The principal of each of these schools was then contacted in order to determine which of the schools could be included in the sample. The criteria for inclusion were as follows.

(1) The team teaching conducted in the school must be consistent with the definition used in this study.

(2) The majority of the teachers teaching junior high school students in the school must be involved in team teaching.

Four of the public schools and two of the separate schools

were, on the basis of these criteria, designated as team teaching schools for the purposes of the study.

After the team teaching schools were selected, the central office staff members were again contacted and asked to select a similar number of conventional schools. In making their selection, they were requested to match the conventional schools with the team teaching schools as closely as possible on aspects such as socio-economic status of the district, characteristics of the principal, and junior high school enrolment in the school. Although such a matching procedure was recognized as being quite subjective, having the schools matched to some extent was felt to contribute to much more meaningful results than a completely random selection of the conventional schools.

Collection and treatment of the data. Each of the twelve schools was visited and the project was explained to the principal. An attempt was made to attend a staff meeting in each school in order to introduce the study and distribute the questionnaire but this was only possible in three of the schools.

The questionnaires were ready for distribution just two weeks prior to the Easter vacation. Some of the schools had already held their monthly staff meetings and because of the Easter vacation would not be holding another one for a period in excess of a month. Consequently, if a staff meeting was to be attended in each of the schools, the completion of the study would have been seriously delayed and other limitations may have been imposed on the study (e.g., conditions in the schools associated with job satisfaction varying throughout the time interval). In order that the questionnaires could be distributed and collected before the Easter vacation, staff meetings were attended only

in those schools which were holding them in the week during which the questionnaires were distributed.

Each teacher was given a Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (Appendix A.1), a personal and professional data questionnaire (Appendix A.2), a list of instructions (Appendix A.3) and a printed answer sheet (Appendix A.4). The teachers were requested to seal the materials in the envelopes provided and return them to the individual selected to collect the materials in each school. The completed questionnaires were collected after two or three days and follow-up visits were made to all schools in order to achieve a high return.

The responses to the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire were scored in accordance with the instructions in the manual. (3:8) Weights for the items were assigned as follows:

(1) When "A" agree was the keyed response, the weights were:

A	PA	PD	D
4	3	2	1

(2) When "D" disagree was the keyed response, the weights were:

A	PA	PD	D
1	2	3	4

Factor scores were derived by summing the weights which have been assigned to the items belonging to a given factor.* The total score is the sum of all factor scores. The ten factor scores and the total were normalized to a mean of five and a standard deviation of one.

The comparison of continuous variables such as satisfaction scores, age, years of experience, and years of post-secondary education with dichotomous variables such as the type of teaching

*See Appendix A.1 for the keyed responses and the factors to which the individual items belong.

situation (team and conventional) and sex involved the use of t tests.

Pearson product-moment correlations were utilized when it was necessary to show relationships among continuous variables. For example, correlations were used to show the relationship between satisfaction scores and experience in team teaching.

The level of probability accepted as significant was set at 0.05. (1:166)

Assumptions. This study was carried out on the basis of three basic assumptions. These assumptions were that:

- (1) the teachers' anonymous responses were reliable and that the opinionnaire was a valid and comprehensive measure of teacher satisfaction;
- (2) team teaching, as defined in this study, was actually being conducted in those schools designated as team teaching schools; and
- (3) the use of parametric statistics was suitable for the data collected from the questionnaires (i.e., the responses from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the variables of age, experience, training, and enthusiasm were assumed to be continuous).

Delimitations. The study was delimited to full-time junior high school teachers in team teaching schools in the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District, and a comparable group in conventional schools in the two systems. All principals, all teachers who reported spending fifty per cent or more of their working time on administrative duties, and part-time teachers were omitted from the sample. The measure of satisfaction of the teachers was delimited to the 1968-1969 school year.

Limitations. Suggestions have been made that satisfaction will vary throughout the school year due to circumstances within the school. Circumstances may have existed at the time of the administration of the opinionnaire which led to high or low satisfaction. Consequently, a major limitation of the study was that the level of satisfaction measured at the time of the administration of the opinionnaire may not have been indicative of the general level of satisfaction of the teachers throughout the school year.

Every attempt was made to conceal the purpose of the study from the respondents. No indication was given that the results from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire were to yield a measure of teacher satisfaction, nor were the teachers told that team and conventional groups of teachers were being compared on the basis of their scores on the opinionnaire. However, the respondents probably did realize that a comparison was being made of team teachers and conventional teachers. This realization would have resulted from the last section of the questionnaire which was to be answered by "team teachers only." Although this may have biased the results in some respects, there is no way of knowing the extent or direction of such bias.

A final limitation of the study is a limitation inherent in any study which insures the anonymity of the respondents. Since the respondents were not identified, no attempt could be made to approach them individually if their questionnaire was not returned or if it was incomplete. Consequently, follow-up attempts to insure a high return could only be made generally to all individuals participating in the study. Those respondents who did not complete their questionnaires or who returned them incomplete may have biased the returns, especially

if they did not return or complete them because of some factor in their teaching situation associated with their job satisfaction.

Summary of Chapter III

The instrument selected to measure teacher satisfaction was the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. In addition, a questionnaire was developed which was composed of two sections. The data obtained from the first section provided personal and professional information from both the team teachers and the conventional teachers. The second section was answered only by the teachers involved in team teaching and provided data pertaining to the length of their experience in team teaching, their initial and present enthusiasm toward team teaching, and the manner in which they became involved in team teaching. It was assumed that these instruments produced reliable and valid responses.

A total of twelve Edmonton schools was selected to participate in the study. The first six to be selected were team teaching schools. An equal number of matching conventional schools was then chosen. The questionnaires were distributed to the full-time junior high school teachers in the selected schools.

The responses to the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire were scored in accordance with the instructions in the manual. Comparisons and relationships among the variables were shown by means of t tests and Pearson product-moment correlations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTER III

1. Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
2. Johnson, B. K. "An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.
3. Rempel, Averno, and Ralph R. Bentley. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. West Lafayette: University Book Store, 1967.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

This chapter presents data which include a description of the schools from which the sample was drawn, a summary of the distribution and return of the questionnaire, and a description of the personal and professional characteristics of the teachers in the sample. In each case, with the exception of data which pertain only to the team teachers in the sample, the data for both the team and conventional teachers were presented together so that comparisons between the groups could be made.

Characteristics of the Schools

The total enrolment of the twelve schools in the sample ranged from 265 to 782 students and the total number of teachers in the schools ranged from 13 to 36. Five of the schools were combined elementary-junior high schools and seven had junior high school grades only.

An examination of Table I shows that the team teaching schools, with a mean enrolment of 394.66, were on the whole considerably smaller than the conventional schools, for which the mean enrolment was 622.67. However, when only the secondary pupils and teachers in the schools were considered, the figures were quite comparable. The mean enrolment of secondary pupils was 367 in the team teaching schools and 368 in the conventional schools; the mean number of secondary teachers was 20.00 in the team teaching schools and 19.33 in the conventional schools. The number of secondary teachers ranged from nine to thirty-one in the team teaching schools and from nine to thirty-five in the conventional schools.

TABLE I
NUMBERS OF PUPILS AND TEACHERS IN EACH SCHOOL

School		Total no. of pupils	Total no. of teachers	No. of elem. pupils	No. of sec. pupils	No. of elem. teachers*	No. of sec. teachers*
TEAM TEACHING SCHOOLS	A	566	31	---	566	--	31
	B	503	28	---	503	--	28
	C	333	16	166	167	7	9
	D	376	21	---	376	--	21
	E	265	13	---	265	--	13
	F	325	18	---	325	--	18
Total		2368	127	166	2202	7	120
Mean		394.66	21.17	166	367	7	20
CONVENTIONAL SCHOOLS	G	619	29	291	328	11	18
	H	501	25	299	202	13	12
	I	580	29	---	580	--	29
	J	669	35	---	669	--	35
	K	782	36	561	221	23	13
	L	585	23	377	208	14	9
Total		3736	177	1528	2208	61	116
Mean		622.67	29.50	382	368	15.25	19.33
Grand total		6104	304	1694	4410	68	236
Grand mean		508.67	25.33	141.17	367.5	5.67	19.67

*Includes administrators and part-time teachers.

Response to the Questionnaire

The number and percentage of questionnaires distributed, returned, and in usable condition from each of the team teaching schools and conventional schools is shown in Table II. The total usable return of 81.32 per cent, although considered satisfactory, was lower than anticipated in light of the attempt made to ensure a high return. This may have been due in part to two factors: (1) some of the principals indicated that the teachers in their schools had already participated in a number of research projects during the year, and (2) the questionnaires were distributed just two weeks prior to the Easter vacation which was apparently quite a busy period due to the extra duties associated with examinations. Consequently, a number of the teachers may have felt too burdened with previous questionnaires and the demands of examination time to return the questionnaires or to fill them out completely.

A total of eighty-three questionnaires was distributed to the team teaching schools and ninety-nine to the conventional schools for a total distribution of 182. The number distributed to individual team teaching schools ranged from eight to twenty-one. The range in the conventional schools was from eight to thirty-one.

Sixty-nine of the eighty-three questionnaires distributed to the team teaching schools and seventy-nine of the ninety-nine distributed to the conventional schools were usable for the analysis. The total number of usable questionnaires was 148. The number of questionnaires which were finally used from each of the team teaching schools ranged from four to fifteen. In the conventional schools the range was from six to twenty-three.

TABLE II

NUMBERS OF QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RETURNED

	TEAM TEACHING SCHOOLS						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Number of questionnaires distributed	21	15	8	13	11	15	83
Number of questionnaires returned	18	15	5	13	9	13	73
Percentage returned	85.71	100.00	62.50	100.00	81.82	86.87	87.95
Number of usable questionnaires*	15	15	4	13	9	13	69
Percentage usable	71.43	100.00	50.00	100.00	81.82	86.67	83.13
	CONVENTIONAL SCHOOLS						Grand
	G	H	I	J	K	L	Total Total
Number of questionnaires distributed	13	8	26	32	12	8	99 182
Number of questionnaires returned	13	7	19	25	12	8	84 157
Percentage returned	100.00	87.50	73.07	78.12	100.00	100.00	84.85 86.26
Number of usable questionnaires*	13	6	18	23	12	7	79 148
Percentage usable	100.00	75.00	69.23	71.87	100.00	87.50	79.80 81.82

*Partially completed and blank questionnaires were discarded.

Characteristics of the Teachers

The variables related to the teachers fall into two fairly distinct groups, dealing with personal and professional characteristics.

Personal variables. Of the 148 teachers in the usable sample, seventy-two were male and seventy-six were female. Although there were slightly more females than males in the total sample, the males were the larger group in the sample of team teachers with 55.07 per cent of the total male and 44.93 per cent female. Among the conventional teachers, however, there were more females than males, females comprising 56.96 per cent of the total and males the remaining 43.04 per cent. Data regarding the frequency distribution of the sex of the respondents are summarized in Table III.

The frequency distribution of the marital status of the teachers in the sample is also summarized in Table III. The largest proportion of teachers in both the team teaching schools and the conventional schools were married (approximately 70 per cent in both). The respondents described as having single status comprised 26.08 per cent of the team teachers and 22.78 per cent of the conventional teachers. A total of 4.35 per cent of the team teachers and 7.59 per cent of the conventional teachers were in the category accounting for status classified as other than single or married. This distribution indicated very similar proportions of team teachers and conventional teachers in each of the marital status categories.

The distribution of the ages of the team and conventional teachers, shown in Table IV, was positively skewed for both groups. No teachers reported ages of under twenty years and only three were over fifty-five. The proportion of teachers in the youngest age category

TABLE III

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SEX AND MARITAL STATUS
OF TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

	SEX		MARITAL STATUS			
	Category	Frequency	Precentage frequency	Category	Frequency	Percentage frequency
TEAM TEACHERS	Male	38	55.07	Married	18	26.08
	Female	31	44.93	Single	48	69.56
				Other	3	4.35
CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS	Male	34	43.04	Married	18	22.87
	Female	45	56.96	Single	55	69.62
				Other	6	7.59

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF AGES OF
TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

Category	Range (years)	Frequency		Percentage frequency	
		Team teachers (N=69)	Conventional teachers (N=79)	Team teachers	Conventional teachers
8	over 55	1	2	1.45	2.55
7	51-55	--	6	---	7.59
6	46-50	4	4	5.80	5.06
5	41-45	2	6	2.90	7.59
4	36-40	5	7	7.25	8.86
3	31-35	7	11	10.14	13.92
2	26-30	29	16	42.03	20.25
1	20-25	21	27	30.43	34.18

(20-25 years) was nearly the same in both groups but proportionately more than twice as many team teachers as conventional were in the next category (26-30 years). All age categories which included individuals older than thirty years, with the exception of the 46-50 years category, had a larger proportion of conventional teachers in them than team teachers.

Professional variables. A comparison of the number of years of teaching experience of the team teachers and conventional teachers is shown in Table V. With the exception of the second category which included teachers with two years of teaching experience, each of the first four categories contained a larger proportion of team teachers than conventional teachers. The total of the percentage frequencies in the first four categories revealed that 88.40 per cent of the team teachers and 70.88 per cent of the conventional teachers in the sample had less than ten years of experience--a difference of over 17 per cent. Another noteworthy comparison is the proportion of teachers in each group who were in their first year of teaching. Whereas only 6 per cent of the conventional teachers were in this category, 16 per cent of the team teachers were just beginning their careers.

The distribution of the years of post-secondary education of the team teachers and the conventional teachers, also illustrated in Table V, was close to normal with the heaviest concentration of both groups having four years of training. An examination of the percentage distribution in each category indicates very little difference between the team teachers and the conventional teachers.

Table VI provides a comparison of the distribution of the team and conventional teachers in terms of the subject area in which the

TABLE V

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF YEARS OF TEACHING
EXPERIENCE AND POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF TEAM TEACHERS
AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

	TEACHING EXPERIENCE			POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION		
	Range (years)	Frequency	Percentage frequency	Range (years)	Frequency	Percentage frequency
TEAM TEACHERS	20 or more	4	5.80	6 or more	4	5.80
	10-19	4	5.80	5	20	28.98
	5-9	27	39.13	4	32	46.37
	3-4	17	24.64	3	5	7.25
	2	6	8.69	2	8	11.59
	1	11	15.94	1	--	--
CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS	20 or more	12	15.20	6 or more	6	7.59
	10-19	11	13.92	5	21	26.58
	5-9	21	26.58	4	36	45.57
	3-4	19	24.05	3	7	8.86
	2	11	13.92	2	8	10.12
	1	5	6.33	1	1	1.26

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF TEAM TEACHERS AND
CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE BY SUBJECT AREA IN WHICH
THE MAJORITY OF THEIR TEACHING TIME WAS SPENT

Subject	Frequency		Percentage frequency	
	Team teachers (N=69)	Conventional teachers (N=79)	Team teachers	Conventional teachers
Mathematics	12	12	17.34	15.19
Science	15	10	21.74	12.66
Social Studies	15	11	21.74	13.92
English	14	18	20.29	22.78
French	5	6	7.25	7.59
Physical Education	3	9	4.35	11.39
Fine Arts	2	6	2.90	7.59
Home Ec. or Ind. Arts	3	7	4.35	8.86

majority of their teaching time was spent. The largest proportions of both groups were primarily engaged in teaching the core academic subject areas of mathematics, science, social studies, and English. Much smaller proportions spent most of their teaching time in the other subject areas of French, physical education, the fine arts, home economics and industrial arts. A comparison of the distribution of the two groups revealed that a larger proportion of team teachers (81.11 per cent) than conventional teachers (64.55 per cent) spent the majority of their teaching time in the core academic areas. Conversely, a larger proportion of conventional teachers than team teachers spent the majority of their teaching time in the other subject areas.

Data from the team teachers. In addition to the personal and professional data discussed previously in this chapter, the team teachers in the sample provided information relevant to their involvement in team teaching. This information is summarized in Tables VII, VIII, and IX.

An examination of Table VII reveals that 50.72 per cent of the respondents were engaged in their first year in a team teaching situation and that 82.60 per cent were either in their first or second year of team teaching. A relatively small proportion of the team teachers in the sample (17.40 per cent) reported having more than two years of team teaching experience.

Two items were included in the questionnaire in order to obtain the teachers' perception of their enthusiasm toward their involvement in a team teaching situation, both initially and presently (i.e., at the time of the distribution of the questionnaire). The summary of the responses to the items, presented in Table VIII, indicates that

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
IN TEAM TEACHING OF TEAM TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE
(N=69)

Number of years of team teaching experience	Frequency	Percentage frequency
5 or more	1	1.45
4	6	8.69
3	5	7.25
2	22	31.88
1	35	50.72

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS
 DESCRIBING INITIAL ENTHUSIASM AND PRESENT ENTHUSIASM OF TEAM
 TEACHERS TOWARD THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN TEAM TEACHING
 (N=69)

Teachers' perception of their enthusiasm	<u>Initial Enthusiasm</u>		<u>Present Enthusiasm</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage frequency	Frequency	Percentage frequency
very high	26	37.68	19	27.54
high	17	24.64	22	31.88
moderate	22	31.88	22	31.88
low	3	4.35	3	4.35
very low	1	1.45	3	4.35

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF TEAM TEACHERS WHO
CHOSE TO BECOME INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING AND THOSE WHO WERE
ASSIGNED TO TEAM TEACHING WITHOUT ANY CHOICE
(N=69)

Method of involvement	Frequency	Percentage frequency
Chose to become involved	50	72.46
Assigned without any choice	19	27.54

both the initial and present enthusiasm of the respondents toward team teaching was perceived by the majority as either high or very high, by nearly one-third as moderate, and by only a small proportion as low or very low. The biggest proportional difference between the initial enthusiasm and present enthusiasm, as perceived by the respondents, was in the "very high" category. Whereas 37.68 per cent of the team teachers perceived their initial enthusiasm as "very high", only 27.54 per cent perceived their present enthusiasm in the same category.

The final fixed response item in the questionnaire was designed to provide an indication of the manner in which the respondents became involved in team teaching. As summarized in Table IX, 72.46 per cent of the team teachers were able to choose to become involved in team teaching whereas 27.54 per cent were assigned to their positions as team teachers without any choice on their part.

The final item on the questionnaire was an open-ended "free response" in which the respondents were requested to briefly describe the events which led up to their appointment in a team teaching situation. Forty-six of the sixty-nine team teachers who completed the rest of the questionnaire answered this item. Although there were a variety of responses to the item, all responses appeared to fall in one of the following five categories.

(1) The respondent requested an appointment or a transfer either to a team teaching school in general or to a particular team teaching school. (N=13)

(2) The respondent came to a team teaching school as a result of personal contacts with either the principal of a team teaching school or a central office supervisor. (N=12)

(3) The respondent was assigned to a team teaching position without any previous consultation. (N=12)

(4) The respondent was a student teacher in a team teaching school and was appointed to a similar position when hired. (N=5)

(5) Other (a variety of responses which neither grouped together nor fell into one of the above categories). (N=4)

Summary of Chapter IV

Junior high school teachers in six team teaching schools and six conventional schools participated in this study. One of the team teaching schools and four of the conventional schools contained both elementary and junior high school grades and the remaining seven schools contained junior high school grades only. A total of 182 questionnaires was distributed to the schools and 148 were found to be usable for the analysis, a total usable return of 81.32 per cent.

The personal variables of the teachers which were described in this chapter were sex, marital status, and age. The total sample contained approximately an equal number of male and female teachers, but the largest proportion of the team teachers was male and the largest proportion of the conventional teachers was female. About 70 per cent of the respondents were married, and the distribution of the team and conventional teachers in each of the marital status categories appeared to be very similar. The distribution of each group according to age tended to be positively skewed, and the majority of both the team teachers (72.46 per cent) and the conventional teachers (54.43 per cent) were less than thirty-one years of age.

Professional data pertaining to the number of years of teaching experience, the number of years of post-secondary education, and the

main teaching subject area were also included in this chapter. Examination of the distribution of years of teaching experience revealed that 16 per cent of the team teachers and 6 per cent of the conventional teachers were in their first year of teaching, and that 88.40 per cent of the team teachers and 70.88 per cent of the conventional teachers had less than ten years of teaching experience. The distribution of the years of post-secondary education of the team teachers and the conventional teachers was close to normal with the heaviest concentration of both groups having four years of training. An examination of the distribution of the team teachers and the conventional teachers according to the subject area in which the majority of their teaching time was spent revealed that a larger proportion of team teachers than conventional teachers spent the majority of their teaching time in the core academic subject areas of mathematics, science, social studies, and English as opposed to the other subject areas of French, physical education, the fine arts, home economics and industrial arts.

The data which were obtained from only the team teachers revealed that over 80 per cent of the respondents were in either their first or second year of team teaching, that the majority perceived both their initial and present enthusiasm toward team teaching as either high or very high, and that nearly three-quarters had been given the choice of whether or not to become involved in a team teaching situation as opposed to being assigned to their position with no choice on their part.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Included in Chapter V are a description of the findings from each hypothesis tested, a presentation of other noteworthy findings, and a discussion of the findings resulting from the testing of the hypotheses.

The Pearson product-moment correlation and the t test were the methods used to determine whether any significant relationships existed between job satisfaction and the independent variables of the schools and the staffs. The correlation technique seemed to be applicable for the relationships between continuous variables. The independent variables which were continuous were age, years of teaching experience, years of post-secondary education, years of experience in team teaching, and initial and present enthusiasm toward team teaching.

The t test was used when comparisons were made between sub-samples produced on the basis of dichotomous variables. Three of the independent variables were dichotomous, namely, whether the teachers were involved in a team or conventional teaching situation, whether the teachers were male or female, and whether the team teachers chose to become involved in a team teaching situation or were assigned to their positions without any choice.

Appendix B contains a comparison of the mean scores on each of the 100 items of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for teachers in the two types of schools. These results are not commented upon in the thesis and are included for reference only.

Analysis of variance was used to compare the twelve schools in the sample on the basis of the mean satisfaction factor scores and the mean total satisfaction scores of the teachers in the schools.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1.0. "The mean total satisfaction score of teachers involved in team teaching in the team teaching schools is not significantly different from the mean total satisfaction score of the teachers in the conventional schools."

As seen in Table X, the team teachers had a mean total satisfaction score of 50.90 as compared with 49.45 for the conventional teachers. The t value for the difference between these means was 1.357 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore Hypothesis 1.0 of no significant difference between the mean total satisfaction score of team teachers in the team teaching schools and of teachers in the conventional schools could not be rejected.

Hypothesis 1.1-1.10. "The mean satisfaction factor scores of teachers involved in team teaching in the team teaching schools are not significantly different from those of the teachers in the conventional schools."

As indicated in Table X the value of t did not reach acceptable levels of probability for the following factors: "Rapport with the Principal", "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Rapport Among Teachers", "Teacher Load", "Teacher Status", and "Community Pressures." Therefore, Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.7 and 1.10 of no significant difference between the mean scores could not be rejected.

Although the value of t on "Rapport with Principal" was lower than that required for significance at the 0.05 level, it was high enough to be indicative of a tendency among the team teachers to be more satisfied with this aspect of their working situation.

TABLE X
MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES
OF TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS

Factor	Mean Scores*		t	Level of Probability (two-tail)
	Team (N=69)	Conventional (N=79)		
1. Teacher rapport with principal	5.17	4.87	1.866	0.064
2. Satisfaction with teaching	4.98	5.04	-0.368	0.714
3. Rapport among teachers	5.05	4.98	0.385	0.700
4. Teacher salary	4.79	5.20	-2.563	0.011
5. Teacher load	5.01	4.99	0.076	0.939
6. Curriculum issues	5.42	4.66	5.025	0.000
7. Teacher status	4.99	5.03	-0.249	0.803
8. Community support of education	5.21	4.86	2.118	0.036
9. School facilities and services	5.40	4.66	4.819	0.000
10. Community pressures	4.89	5.15	-1.564	0.120
TOTAL SCORE	50.90	49.45	1.357	0.177

*Scores have been normalized to a mean of 5.0 and a standard deviation of 1.0.

The value of t reached acceptable levels of probability for four of the ten factors. The team teachers had a significantly lower mean score on "Teacher Salary", and significantly higher mean scores on "Curriculum Issues", "Community Support of Education", and "School Facilities and Services." Therefore Hypotheses 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, and 1.9 were rejected.

Hypothesis 2.0. "There is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction of team teachers and the number of years that they have been involved in team teaching."

The correlation coefficients of each of the ten satisfaction factors and total satisfaction with the years of experience in team teaching are shown in Table XI. The coefficients were all positive, and the value needed for significance at the 0.05 level was reached in four instances. Length of experience in team teaching correlated significantly with "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services", and total satisfaction. No significant correlation was found between length of experience in team teaching and "Rapport with the Principal", "Rapport Among Teachers", "Teacher Salary", "Teacher Load", "Curriculum Issues", "Teacher Status", and "Community Pressures."

The value of the correlation coefficient between length of experience in team teaching and "Teacher Salary" was lower than the figure required for significance at the 0.05 level, but nevertheless was high enough to indicate a tendency toward a relationship.

In accordance with the findings summarized above, there was no evidence to reject Hypothesis 2.0 for the correlations between length of experience in team teaching and factors 1,3,4,5,6,7, and 10. For the

TABLE XI

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE IN TEAM
TEACHING AND SATISFACTION OF TEAM TEACHERS

Factor	Correlations	Level of probability
1. Teacher rapport with principal	0.079	0.520
2. Satisfaction with teaching	0.243	0.044
3. Rapport among teachers	0.137	0.263
4. Teacher salary	0.235	0.052
5. Teacher load	0.118	0.336
6. Curriculum issues	0.154	0.206
7. Teacher status	0.162	0.183
8. Community support of education	0.374	0.001
9. School facilities and services	0.257	0.033
10. Community pressures	0.101	0.407
TOTAL SCORE	0.250	0.038

correlations between length of experience in team teaching and factors 2,8 and 9 and total satisfaction Hypothesis 2.0 was rejected.

Hypothesis 3.0. "The mean satisfaction factor scores and total satisfaction score of the teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching are not significantly different from those of the teachers who were assigned to team teaching positions."

An examination of Table XII reveals that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and teachers who were assigned to team teaching positions on any of the satisfaction factor scores or on the total satisfaction score. Therefore, there was no evidence to reject Hypothesis 3.0 of no significant difference between the mean satisfaction factor scores and total satisfaction score of the teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and the teachers who were assigned to team teaching positions.

Other Findings

In addition to the findings resulting from the testing of the hypotheses, other findings were noteworthy and had some bearing on the hypotheses of the study.

As may be seen in Table XIII, a comparison of the mean ages and the mean number of years of teaching experience of both groups revealed a difference significant at the 0.05 level with the team teachers being the younger group and the group with the least amount of teaching experience. However, a comparison of the mean number of years of post-secondary education revealed no significant difference between the two groups. Furthermore, since the level of probability was .941, the

TABLE XII

MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES OF TEAM TEACHERS WHO CHOSE TO BECOME INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING AND THOSE WHO WERE GIVEN NO CHOICE REGARDING THEIR INVOLVEMENT

Factor	Mean Scores		t	Level of probability (two-tail)
	Chose (N=50)	No choice (N=19)		
1. Teacher rapport with principal	5.23	5.01	0.841	0.403
2. Satisfaction with teaching	5.08	4.72	1.379	0.172
3. Rapport among teachers	5.12	4.85	1.075	0.286
4. Teacher salary	4.84	4.65	0.748	0.457
5. Teacher load	5.09	4.79	1.188	0.239
6. Curriculum issues	5.45	5.34	0.474	0.637
7. Teacher status	5.10	4.71	1.452	0.151
8. Community support of education	5.32	4.90	1.709	0.092
9. School facilities and services	5.47	5.23	1.093	0.278
10. Community pressures	4.95	4.76	0.747	0.457
TOTAL SCORE	51.64	48.96	1.687	0.096

TABLE XIII

MEAN AGE, MEAN YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND MEAN YEARS
OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF TEAM TEACHERS
AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

Variable	Means		t	Level of probability (two-tail)
	Team (N=69)	Conventional (N=79)		
Age	3.32	3.94	-2.013 ^a	0.046 ^a
Years of teaching experience	3.28	3.73	-1.992	0.048
Years of post- secondary education	4.10	4.09	0.073	0.941

^aWelch t Prime Approximation

probability of a difference occurring between the groups on this variable was very small indeed.

As Table XIV illustrates, no significant differences were found between the male and female team teachers on any of the satisfaction factors or on the total satisfaction score, and a comparison of the mean scores of the male and female conventional teachers revealed a significant difference on only one factor. Female conventional teachers were found to have a significantly higher mean score on "Teacher Status."

In a comparison of male team teachers with male conventional teachers, the male team teachers had significantly higher mean scores on "Teacher Rapport with the Principal", "Curriculum Issues", "Community Support of Education", and "School Facilities and Services". A similar comparison among female teachers showed the team teachers to have significantly higher mean scores on "Curriculum Issues", and "School Facilities and Services" (Table XV).

Relationships between the satisfaction factor scores and the age, years of teaching experience, and years of post-secondary education of the team teachers are shown in Table XVI. In the relationships between age and the satisfaction factor scores, the age of the team teachers was found to produce significant negative correlation coefficients with "Teacher Status" and "Community Support of Education." No significant relationships were found between the number of years of teaching experience of the team teachers and the satisfaction scores; nor was significance reached in the correlations between the number of years of post-secondary education of the team teachers and the satisfaction factor scores.

Relationships between the satisfaction factor scores and the age,

TABLE XIV

MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES OF MALE AND FEMALE
TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE TEACHING SITUATION

FACTOR	TEAM TEACHERS				CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS			
	Male (N=38) Mean Scores	Female (N=31) Mean Scores	t	Level of probability (two-tail)	Male (N=34) Mean Scores	Female (N=45) Mean Scores	t	Level of probability (two-tail)
1. Teacher rapport with principal	5.35	4.96	1.721	0.090	4.94	4.81	0.584	0.561
2. Satisfaction with teaching	5.05	4.89	0.666	0.508	4.88	5.16	-1.200	0.234
3. Rapport among teachers	5.18	4.89	1.264	0.211	5.07	4.91	0.647	0.520
4. Teacher salary	4.79	4.78	0.061	0.952	5.23	5.19	0.168	0.867
5. Teacher load	4.97	5.05	-0.375	0.709	4.98	5.00	-0.093	0.926
6. Curriculum issues	5.41	5.43	-0.065	0.948	4.69	4.64	0.198	0.843
7. Teacher status	4.91	5.09	-0.771	0.443	4.72	5.27	-2.483	0.015
8. Community support of education	5.27	5.12	0.674	0.503	4.69	5.00	-1.323	0.190
9. School facilities and services	5.43	5.38	0.237	0.813	4.84	4.53	1.337	0.185
10. Community pressures	4.84	4.96	-0.567	0.512	5.14	5.15	-0.073	0.942
TOTAL SCORE	51.19	50.55	0.439	0.662	49.16	49.67	-0.317	0.752

TABLE XV

MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES OF TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX

FACTOR	MALE TEACHERS			FEMALE TEACHERS				
	Team (N=38) Mean scores	Conventional (N=34) Mean scores	t	Level of probability (two-tail)	Team (N=31) Mean scores	Conventional (N=45) Mean scores	t	Level of probability (two-tail)
1. Teacher rapport with principal	5.35	4.94	2.116	0.039 ^a	4.96	4.81	0.560	0.577
2. Satisfaction with teaching	5.05	4.88	0.825	0.412	4.89	5.16	-1.029	0.307
3. Rapport among teachers	5.18	5.07	0.469	0.640	4.89	4.91	-0.118	0.906
4. Teacher salary	4.79	5.23	-1.975	0.052	4.78	5.19	-1.661	0.101
5. Teacher load	4.97	4.98	-0.050	0.960	5.05	5.00	0.227	0.821
6. Curriculum issues	5.41	4.69	3.283	0.002	5.43	4.64	3.710	0.000
7. Teacher status	4.91	4.72	0.771	0.443	5.09	5.27	-0.818	0.416
8. Community support of education	5.27	4.69	2.604	0.012 ^a	5.12	5.00	0.540	0.591
9. School facilities and services	5.43	4.89	2.605	0.011	5.38	4.53	3.990	0.000
10. Community pressures	4.84	5.14	-1.489	0.141	4.96	5.15	-0.741	0.461
TOTAL SCORE	51.19	49.16	1.361	0.178	50.55	49.67	0.562	0.575

^aWelch t Prime Approximation

TABLE XVI

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND AGE, YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND YEARS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS

FACTOR	TEAM TEACHERS			CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS		
	Age	Years of teaching experience	Years of post-secondary education	Age	Years of teaching experience	Years of post-secondary education
1. Teacher rapport with principal	0.051	0.087	-0.161	-0.065	0.153	0.156
2. Satisfaction with teaching	0.090	0.108	-0.034	0.027	0.104	0.101
3. Rapport among teachers	0.097	0.019	-0.167	0.034	0.171	0.198
4. Teacher salary	0.203	0.004	-0.023	0.118	0.225*	0.140
5. Teacher load	0.076	-0.185	-0.209	0.050	0.030	0.353*
6. Curriculum issues	-0.120	-0.044	-0.142	0.028	-0.026	0.077
7. Teacher status	0.238*	0.041	-0.102	-0.062	0.038	0.093
8. Community support of education	0.268*	0.134	-0.074	0.076	0.105	0.092
9. School facilities and services	0.004	0.128	-0.120	0.220	0.218	0.233*
10. Community pressures	0.140	0.029	-0.188	-0.011	0.060	0.200
TOTAL SCORE	0.153	0.050	-0.187	0.061	0.161	0.245*

*Significant at an acceptable level of probability, i.e. ≥ 0.05 .

years of experience, and years of post-secondary education of the conventional teachers are also shown in Table XVI. No relationships were found to be significant at the 0.05 level between ages of the conventional teachers and the satisfaction factor scores. A significant positive relationship was found between the number of years of teaching experience of the conventional teachers and one of the satisfaction factors, "Teacher Salary." The number of years of post-secondary education of the conventional teachers produced significant positive correlation coefficients with two of the satisfaction factor scores ("Teacher Load" and "School Facilities and Services") and with the total satisfaction score.

Comparison of the number of years of experience (both total experience and team teaching experience) of the teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and those who were assigned to their team teaching positions are shown in Table XVII. No significant differences were found between the team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and those who were assigned to their positions on the length of their total teaching experience. A comparison of the same groups on the length of team teaching experience, however, did reveal a t value for the difference between the means significant at the 0.05 level. Team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching had a significantly greater number of years of experience in team teaching than the teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions.

In Table XVIII the enthusiasm (both initial and present) of the team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching is compared with that of the team teachers who were assigned to their

TABLE XVII

NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (TOTAL AND TEAM TEACHING) OF
TEAM TEACHERS WHO CHOSE TO BECOME INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING
AND TEAM TEACHERS WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO THEIR POSITIONS

Variable	Means		t	Level of probability (two-tail)
	Chose (N=50)	Assigned (N=19)		
Number of years of total teaching experience	3.46	2.79	1.878	0.065
Number of years of team teaching experience	1.94	1.37	2.149	0.004 ^a

^aWelch t Prime Approximation

TABLE XVIII

THE ENTHUSIASM (INITIAL AND PRESENT) OF TEAM TEACHERS WHO CHOSE
TO BECOME INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING AND TEAM TEACHERS
WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO THEIR POSITIONS

Variable	<u>Mean responses</u>		t	Level of probability (two-tail)
	Chose (N=50)	Assigned (N=19)		
Initial enthusiasm upon being assigned to a team teaching position	3.96	3.84	0.433	0.666
Present enthusiasm toward involvement in a team teaching situation	3.86	3.42	1.564	0.122

positions. It was found that there were no significant differences between the two groups on either their initial enthusiasm upon being assigned to a team teaching position or their present enthusiasm toward involvement in a team teaching situation.

A comparison was made of the twelve schools in the sample on the basis of the mean satisfaction factor scores and mean total satisfaction scores of the teachers in the schools in order to determine any inter-school differences that may have occurred. As indicated in Table XIX, significant inter-school differences occurred between the mean scores for four of the satisfaction factors ("Teacher Rapport with the Principal", "Teacher Salary", "Community Support of Education", and "School Facilities and Services"). All of the inter-school differences, with the exception of two in "School Facilities and Services", occurred between team teaching schools and conventional schools. In the two exceptions the differences occurred between conventional schools.

The inter-school differences observed were very few in number and could, perhaps, have occurred by chance alone considering that the number of possible differences in each factor is sixty-six*. Consequently, very little of the difference in job satisfaction that did occur could have been attributed to the differences among schools.

Discussion of the Findings

The lack of a significant difference on the total satisfaction

*The number of possible combinations was calculated using the formula $C_r^n = \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$. (1:87)

TABLE XIX

MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES OF THE TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SCHOOL

FACTOR	SCHOOLS (MEAN SCORES)												Schools between which means were significantly different*
	Team teaching schools						Conventional schools						
	A (N=15)	B (N=15)	C (N=4)	D (N=13)	E (N=9)	F (N=13)	G (N=13)	H (N=6)	I (N=18)	J (N=23)	K (N=12)	L (N=7)	
1. Teacher rapport with principal	4.59	5.00	5.92	5.35	5.12	5.65	5.08	5.62	5.10	4.29	5.59	3.86	F-J; F-L
2. Satisfaction with teaching	4.63	5.07	5.70	4.85	4.80	5.30	5.10	5.20	4.85	5.09	5.36	4.56	- - -
3. Rapport among teachers	4.95	5.23	5.45	4.99	4.59	5.18	5.16	5.41	4.69	4.59	5.67	5.10	- - -
4. Teacher salary	4.85	4.19	4.07	4.61	5.15	5.54	5.31	5.52	4.99	4.80	5.79	5.56	B-K
5. Teacher load	5.16	4.73	5.91	5.08	4.90	5.18	4.52	5.64	4.98	4.76	5.93	4.51	- - -
6. Curriculum issues	5.09	5.51	5.33	5.27	5.80	5.61	4.99	4.60	4.72	4.70	4.86	3.48	B-L; D-L; E-L; F-L
7. Teacher status	5.02	4.70	4.51	4.72	5.22	5.56	4.85	5.67	5.17	4.61	5.59	4.88	- - -
8. Community support of education	5.35	5.14	5.30	4.82	4.77	5.77	5.25	5.59	5.30	4.38	4.41	4.76	F-J
9. School facilities and services ^a	5.06	5.72	5.10	4.77	5.54	6.06	4.33	4.69	4.24	4.62	5.74	4.64	B-G; B-I; F-G; F-I F-J; G-I; I-K
10. Community pressures ^a	5.16	4.96	5.15	4.71	4.75	4.71	5.03	5.08	5.10	4.84	6.10	4.88	- - -
TOTAL SCORE	49.87	50.26	51.45	49.20	50.62	54.56	49.62	53.02	49.16	46.70	55.06	46.23	- - -

^aThe basic assumption for a parametric test, homogeneity of variance, was violated. In these instances a non-parametric test, Kruskal-Wallis, was used.

*The Scheffé Multiple Comparison of Means test was employed to determine the significant differences at the 0.10 level. (1:296-297) This method allows for the discrepancy which results from the unequal numbers in the groups.

score of team and conventional teachers, revealed in the testing of Hypothesis 1.0, provides evidence that in the sample studied there was no dominant effect of the teaching situation on the job satisfaction of the teachers. It also supports the use of multi-dimensional approaches to the study of job satisfaction since fairly substantial differences were found in some factors even though no significant difference was found on the total satisfaction score.

The differences found on "Teacher Salary" (Hypothesis 1.4) were unexpected in view of the salary policies and bargaining procedures used in the Edmonton school systems. However, the lower satisfaction of the team teachers may be a result of the fact that they had significantly fewer years of teaching experience than the conventional teachers (Table XIII, p.62) and were sensitive to the salary differences resulting from this. Another possible explanation of the findings is provided by Johnson who also found significant differences on "Teacher Salary" between the two groups of Edmonton teachers compared in his study: ". . . the salary issue was used by teachers who were dissatisfied with other aspects of their work as a 'scapegoat'." (2:71) If team teachers saw their position as difficult and unrewarding, they may have expressed their disgruntled feelings in terms of salary dissatisfaction.

Since the team teaching schools are frequently referred to as "experimental schools", and since many of the curricular innovations are first attempted in these schools, the differences found on "Curriculum Issues" are possibly an indication of the freedom the team teachers feel they have to make changes in the curriculum to meet their needs. The differences may also be an indication of the greater

satisfaction team teachers derive from having opportunities to exchange ideas pertaining to the organization of the curriculum with their colleagues, a feature of the working situation commonly associated with cooperative teaching.

The differences found on "Community Support of Education" reveal that team teachers tend to be more satisfied with the degree of community support given to education in their areas. Further analysis, illustrated in Table XV (p.65), indicated that these differences could only be attributed to the male teachers. Whereas the male team teachers had a significantly higher mean score on "Community Support of Education" than the male conventional teachers, no significant differences were found between the female team teachers and female conventional teachers.

The differences found on "Community Support of Education" may possibly be an indication of the interest of the community in the team approach to school organization and their support for such a program. Such interest may be perceived by the team teachers as a result of the numerous visits paid to the school by individuals interested in observing cooperative teaching.

The differences found on "School Facilities and Services" reveal that team teachers are more satisfied with the facilities and services in their schools than the conventional teachers. A possible explanation for this finding is that the team teaching schools in the sample are newer, have newer facilities, and contain features which are lacking in the conventional schools (e.g., large teaching areas, centrally located instructional materials centers, and closed circuit television). Furthermore, the facilities and services which are available in the schools may possibly be more readily utilized when a team

approach is employed.

Findings related to Hypothesis 2.0 indicate that the job satisfaction of the team teachers tends to be associated with the length of experience in team teaching. Significant relationships were found between length of team teaching experience and "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services", and the total satisfaction score. All the correlation coefficients which were found to be significant at the 0.05 level were positive, indicating that teachers with more experience in team teaching express greater job satisfaction than those with less experience in team teaching. This possibly results from the initial frustration of teachers in a team situation when they encounter new relationships with other teachers and students and other aspects of school organization which are different from the more conventional approach.

Although similar relationships may be suspected between job satisfaction and total teaching experience, Table XVI (p.66) reveals that none were found. No significant relationships were found between the job satisfaction of team teachers and their total experience; and among conventional teachers, the only significant relationship that was found was between "Teacher Salary" and total teaching experience.

However, since over 80 per cent of the team teachers had less than three years of teaching experience (Table VII, p.49), any generalization made in regard to Hypothesis 2.0 must be tempered by the evidence of this lack of team teaching experience. The findings from Hypothesis 2.0 became particularly suspect when the job satisfaction of the team teachers with one and two years of team teaching experience

was compared with the job satisfaction of team teachers with three to five years of team teaching experience. As revealed in Table XX, significant differences were found on "Teacher Salary" and "Community Support of Education", team teachers with three to five years of team teaching experience having the higher mean score on both factors. Of the four factors which were found to correlate significantly with years of team teaching experience when testing Hypothesis 2.0, a significant difference was found on only one ("Community Support of Education") when the team teachers with one and two years of team teaching experience were compared to team teachers with three to five years of team teaching experience.

Hypothesis 3.0 was prompted by the findings of a study conducted by Davis which was quoted in Chapter II (p.24): the poorest attitudes toward team teaching were exhibited by those teachers who were forced into the program with no real understanding as to its purpose. No indication of any tendencies in the direction suggested by Davis' findings was felt to exist since no significant differences were found between the mean satisfaction factor scores of teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions without any choice in the matter.

Summary of Findings

The teachers in the conventional schools expressed lower satisfaction than the teachers in the team teaching schools on three of the ten factors (Curriculum Issues, Community Support of Education, and School Facilities and Services) and higher satisfaction on one (Teacher Salary).

TABLE XX

MEAN SATISFACTION FACTOR SCORES AND TOTAL SATISFACTION SCORES OF TEAM TEACHERS WITH ONE AND TWO YEARS OF TEAM TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND TEAM TEACHERS WITH THREE TO FIVE YEARS OF TEAM TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Factor	Mean scores		t	Level of probability (two-tail)
	3 to 5 yrs. team teaching experience (N=12)	1 and 2 yrs. team teaching experience (N=57)		
1. Teacher rapport with principal	5.04	5.20	-0.508	0.613
2. Satisfaction with teaching	5.14	4.94	0.634	0.528
3. Rapport among teachers	5.00	5.05	-0.161	0.872
4. Teacher salary	5.29	4.68	2.118	0.038
5. Teacher load	5.00	5.01	-0.011	0.991
6. Curriculum issues	5.69	5.36	1.246	0.217
7. Teacher status	5.40	4.91	1.571	0.121
8. Community support of education	5.87	5.07	2.916	0.005
9. School facilities and services	5.50	5.39	0.418	0.677
10. Community pressures	5.22	4.83	1.348	0.182
TOTAL SCORE	53.16	50.43	1.456	0.150

Length of experience in team teaching correlated positively with "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services" and total satisfaction. However, these findings should be viewed cautiously since over 80 per cent of the team teachers had less than three years of team teaching experience.

No differences were found between the job satisfaction of teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions without any choice in the matter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTER V

1. Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
2. Johnson, B. K. "An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study

The central problem of this study was to determine if any significant differences existed between job satisfaction of teachers involved in team teaching in team teaching schools and that of teachers in conventional schools. Job satisfaction was taken to be the attitudes of the teachers to various aspects of their work situation as expressed in responses to the items in the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Team teaching was considered to be a teaching situation in which the majority of the staff was formally organized so that groups of teachers accept the responsibility for planning, carrying out, and evaluating an educational program or some major portion of a program for an aggregate of pupils.

Although much of the reviewed literature tended to indicate that the job satisfaction of teachers is enhanced in a team teaching situation, none of the research which was encountered directly studied teacher satisfaction in team teaching schools. Most of the studies were subjective reports of teacher satisfaction in various team teaching experiments conducted in the United States, and others were rather general accounts of teacher attitudes toward team teaching.

In order to obtain a sample which would be large enough to be used for statistical comparisons, the junior high school teachers from schools in both the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District were included. Six schools were selected as being team teaching schools and an equal number were selected as

conventional schools for comparative purposes. Schools were considered to be team teaching schools if the majority of junior high school teachers in them were involved in team teaching as defined in this study. Conventional schools were chosen which were considered to be comparable to the team teaching schools which had been selected.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, purporting to measure ten satisfaction factors and total satisfaction, was administered to the teachers in the twelve schools, and 148 usable returns, representing 81.32 per cent of the total distributed, were received (69 from the team teaching schools and 79 from the conventional schools). Other data were collected by means of a personal and professional data questionnaire.

Satisfaction factor scores and total satisfaction scores were compiled for each respondent and t tests were used to compare the mean scores of the team and conventional teachers as well as those of the male and female teachers and those of team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and teachers who were assigned to team teaching positions without any choice in the matter. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to determine significant relationships between the factor and total scores of the team teachers and the length of their experience in team teaching; and between the factor and total scores of both groups of teachers and age, total years of experience in teaching, and years of post-secondary education.

Three null hypotheses were postulated, pertaining to the differences in job satisfaction of team and conventional teachers, the differences in job satisfaction of team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and those who were assigned to their team teaching positions, and the relationship between the job satisfaction

of the team teachers and the length of their experience in team teaching.

Summary of the Findings

Analysis of the findings showed that the team teachers expressed significantly lower satisfaction with "Teacher Salary" than the conventional teachers, but were significantly more satisfied with "Curriculum Issues", "Community Support of Education", and "School Facilities and Services."

Length of experience in team teaching was found to correlate positively at the 0.05 level with "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services", and the total satisfaction score. However, it was observed that these findings had to be viewed cautiously since over 80 per cent of the team teachers had less than three years of experience in team teaching.

There was no evidence that method of involvement in team teaching had any effect on the job satisfaction of the team teachers. No significant differences were found between the mean satisfaction factor scores and total satisfaction score of teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and those of teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions without any choice in the matter.

In addition to the testing of the hypotheses, further analysis was conducted which revealed that the following differences and relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

(1) The team teachers were significantly younger and had significantly less teaching experience than the conventional teachers.

(2) When the job satisfaction of male and female teachers in each teaching situation was compared, the only significant difference found

was that female conventional teachers expressed greater satisfaction than male conventional teachers on the "Teacher Status" factor.

(3) Both male and female team teachers expressed greater satisfaction than their counterparts in conventional teaching situations with "Curriculum Issues" and "School Facilities and Services". Male team teachers indicated significantly higher satisfaction than male conventional teachers on "Teacher Rapport with Principal" and "Community Support of Education".

(4) The age of the team teachers correlated negatively with "Teacher Status" and "Community Support of Education".

(5) The number of years of teaching experience of the conventional teachers correlated positively with "Teacher Salary", and the number of years of post-secondary education of the conventional teachers correlated positively with "Teacher Load", "School Facilities and Services", and the total satisfaction score.

(6) Team teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching had a significantly greater number of years of experience in team teaching than the teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions without any choice in the matter.

Conclusions

The findings of this study offer some support to the speculation of many writers in the field that team teachers are more satisfied with their working situation than conventional teachers. However, it should be noted that they have expressed greater satisfaction on only three of the ten satisfaction factors so that the type of teaching situation can by no means be considered to be a dominant variable in the determination of teacher job satisfaction. The job satisfaction of teachers is affected

by many variables, among which the type of teaching situation appears to be one.

The largest and most consistent differences between the team teachers and conventional teachers were found on Factor 6: "Curriculum Issues" and Factor 9: "School Facilities and Services." The significantly higher mean score of the team teachers on Factor 6 leads to the conclusion that the team teachers were more satisfied with matters concerning the curriculum than were the conventional teachers. Similarly, the significantly higher mean score of the team teachers on Factor 9 indicates greater satisfaction among the team teachers than among the conventional teachers with the facilities and services provided in their schools.

The other factor on which the team teachers had significantly higher mean scores was Factor 8: "Community Support of Education." The conclusion drawn from this finding is that the team teachers were more satisfied than the conventional teachers with the support given to the educational program in their schools by the community.

The findings concerning these three factors are thought to be an indication of the greater satisfaction of the team teachers purported in the literature reviewed. However, any generalizations which might be made regarding this conclusion must be tempered with caution, especially in view of the failure to find significant differences between the team and conventional teachers on such factors as "Satisfaction with Teaching" and "Rapport Among Teachers."

Although the differences on Factor 4: "Teacher Salary" indicate that the team teachers were less satisfied with salaries and salary policies than the conventional teachers, they may actually reflect lower

satisfaction resulting from the fact that team teachers were less experienced and possibly were sensitive to salary increments being provided on the basis of experience in teaching--not from the fact that they were in a team teaching situation.

No conclusions can be made regarding the significant relationships which were found between length of experience in team teaching and "Satisfaction with Teaching", "Community Support of Education", "School Facilities and Services", and the total satisfaction score. Over 80 per cent of the team teachers had less than three years of team teaching experience, and a greater range of experience is necessary before any conclusions can be reached regarding these relationships.

There was no evidence to suggest that the method of involvement in team teaching had any effect on the job satisfaction of the team teachers. Significant differences were not found on any of the satisfaction scores or on the total satisfaction score between the teachers who chose to become involved in team teaching and the teachers who were assigned to their team teaching positions.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of this study have shown that certain factors in the job satisfaction of teachers appear to be related to whether they are in a team or conventional teaching situation. These findings also indicate a need for further research. Such additional research might be conducted in the following areas:

- (1) Duplication of this type of study in another setting where team teaching has been in effect for a longer period of time or in the Edmonton Public School District and the Edmonton Separate School District when the teachers have had more experience with this pattern of school

organization.

(2) Comparison of the job satisfaction of team and conventional teachers in the elementary and high school.

(3) Comparison of the job satisfaction of team and conventional teachers in the specific subject areas.

(4) Comparison of the job satisfaction of such groups as rural and urban teachers, teachers of low ability students and teachers of high ability students, and teachers of vocational students and teachers of academic students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Anderson, Robert H. Teaching in a World of Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.
- Bair, Medill, and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.
- Beggs, David W. (ed.). Team Teaching. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.
- Hillson, Maurie (ed.). Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Polos, Nicholas C. The Dynamics of Team Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1965.
- Rempel, Averno, and Ralph R. Bentley. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette: University Book Store, 1967.
- Yuzuk, Ronald P. The Assessment of Employee Morale, Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1961.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

- Team Teaching in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Education Association Research and Information Division, 1964.

C. PERIODICALS

- Adair, J. Warren. "Keeping Teachers Happy," The American School Board Journal, 155:28-29, January, 1968.

- Anderson, Robert H. "Organizational Character of Education: Staff Utilization and Deployment," Review of Educational Research, 34:455-469, October, 1964.
- Bischoff, F. X., and F. Enns. "A Team Teaching Project," The Canadian Administrator, 7:1-4, October, 1967.
- Blocker, Clyde E., and Richard C. Richardson. "Twenty-Five Years of Morale Research: A Critical Review," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36:200-210, January, 1963.
- Bloomenshine, L. L., and T. Malcomb Brown. "San Diego, California Conducts a Two Year Experiment with Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:147-166, January, 1961.
- Blumberg, Arthur, and Wilford A. Weber. "Teacher Morale as a Function of Perceived Supervisory Behavioral Style," The Journal of Educational Research, 62:109-113, November, 1968.
- Carlin, Philip M. "A Current Appraisal of Team Teaching," Education, 85:348-353, February, 1965.
- Chase, Francis S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," The Phi Delta Kappan, 33:127-132, November, 1951.
- Clawson, H. A. "Maltoom, Illinois High School Tries Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:93-99, January, 1961.
- Collins, Harold W., and Norbert J. Nelson. "A Study of Teacher Morale--Union (AFT) Teachers versus Non-Union (NEA) Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, 62:3-10, September, 1968.
- Davis, Russell C. "Teacher Assessment of Team Teaching," Science Teacher, 33:38-39, December, 1966.
- Feldvebel, A. M. "Teacher Satisfaction," Clearing House, 43:44-48, September, 1968.
- Gill, N., and B. K. Johnson. "Morale--Part I," The CSA Bulletin, 6:3-24, May, 1967.
- _____. "Morale--Part II," The CSA Bulletin, 6:3-22, June, 1967.
- Goodlad, John I. "Cooperative Teaching in Educational Reform," The National Elementary Principal, 44:9-13, January, 1965.
- Gordon, Garford G. "Conditions of Employment and Service in Elementary and Secondary Schools: Teacher Morale and Job Satisfaction," Review of Educational Research, 33:387-388, October, 1963.

- Hanvey, Robert, and Morton S. Tenenberg. "University of Chicago Laboratory School, Chicago, Illinois, Evaluates Team Teaching," N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 45:189-197, January, 1961.
- Harap, Henry. "Morale," Nation's Schools, 63:55-57, June, 1959.
- Heathers, Glen. "Research on Implementing and Evaluating Cooperative Teaching," The National Elementary Principal, 44:27-33, January, 1965.
- Hedlund, Paul A., and Foster S. Brown. "Conditions That Lower Teacher Morale," Nation's Schools, 48:40-42, September, 1951.
- Hunter, E. C. "Attitudes and Professional Relationships of Teachers: A Study of Teacher Morale," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:345-352, June, 1955.
- Joyce, Bruce R. "Staff Utilization," Review of Educational Research, 37:323-337, June, 1967.
- Lust, A. "McKee School: An Experiment in Instructional Improvement," The CSA Bulletin, 7:15-37, June, 1968.
- Mason, H. et al. "A Report on Team Teaching Adapted to a Standard Secondary School Curriculum," American Biology Teacher, 26:363-365, February, 1964.
- McLaughlin, Jack W., and John T. Shea. "California Teachers' Job Dissatisfaction," California Journal of Educational Research, 11:216-224, November, 1960.
- Meyer, James A. "Group Grope: Problems of Team Teaching," Clearing House, 42:362-4, February, 1968.
- Nystrand, Raphael O., and Frederick Bertolaet. "Strategies for Allocating Human and Material Resources," Review of Educational Research, 37:448-468, October, 1967.
- Redefer, Frederick L. "Factors That Affect Teacher Morale," Nation's Schools, 63:59-62, February, 1959.
- _____. "The School Board and Teacher Morale," The American School Board Journal, 145:5-7, July, 1962.
- Rempel, Averno, and Ralph R. Bentley. "Peer Selection vs. Expert Judgement as a Means of Validating a Teacher Morale Instrument," Journal of Experimental Education, 31:223-240, March, 1963.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," The Journal of Educational Administration, 5:66-82, May, 1967.

- Shaplin, Judson T. "Cooperative Teaching: Definitions and Organizational Analysis," The National Elementary Principal, 44:9-13, January, 1965.
- Smith, D. R. "A Proposed Model for the Investigation of Teacher Morale," The Journal of Educational Administration, 4:143-148, October, 1966.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Bischoff, Francis X. "An Evaluation of a Team Teaching Project." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.
- Johnson, B. K. "An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.
- Keeler, Bernard T. "Dimensions of the Leader Behavior of Principals, Staff Morale and Productivity." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.
- Okonkwo, A. E. N. "A Study of Teachers' Attitudes and Their Relation to Work Satisfaction." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A.1

THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE

Keyed
Responses
Factor No.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Details, "red tape," and required reports absorb too much of my time. | D | 5 |
| 2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal | A | 1 |
| 3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal. | A | 1 |
| 4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education. | A | 4 |
| 5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school. | D | 1 |
| 6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record-keeping and clerical work. | D | 5 |
| 7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty. | A | 1 |
| 8. Community demands upon the teacher's time are unreasonable. | D | 5 |
| 9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted. | A | 4 |
| 10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school. | D | 5 |
| 11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable. | D | 5 |
| 12. Our principal's leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth. | A | 1 |
| 13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire. | A | 7 |
| 14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable. | D | 5 |
| 15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like. | A | 7 |

	Keyed Responses	Factor No.
16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment.	A	9
17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum	A	6
18. There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers.	D	3
19. Teaching gives a great deal of personal satisfaction.	A	2
20. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences.	A	6
21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient.	A	9
22. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another.	A	3
23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives.	A	3
24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.	A	2
25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions.	D	6
26. I love to teach.	A	2
27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.	A	2
28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues.	A	3
29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.	A	2
30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.	D	2
31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage.	D	5

		Keyed Responses	Factor No.
32.	Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.	A	4
33.	My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant.	A	1
34.	Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden.	D	5
35.	Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community.	A	7
36.	Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice.	A	4
37.	Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation.	A	7
38.	My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures.	A	1
39.	Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases.	A	4
40.	My classes are used as a "dumping ground" for problem students.	D	5
41.	The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained.	A	1
42.	My teaching load in this school is unreasonable.	D	5
43.	My principal shows a real interest in my department.	A	1
44.	Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school.	A	1
45.	My heavy teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities.	D	5
46.	I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding.	A	2
47.	I feel that I am an important part of this school system.	A	2

	Keyed Responses	Factor No.
48. The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar.	A	3
49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment.	A	9
50. I feel successful and competent in my present position.	A	2
51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.	A	2
52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with.	A	3
53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs.	A	3
54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.	D	3
55. The teachers in our school work well together.	A	3
56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.	D	2
57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers.	A	9
58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.	A	2
59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach.	A	9
60. The "stress and strain" resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.	D	2
61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.	A	1
62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.	A	1
63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire.	A	7
64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.	A	7

	Keyed Responses	Factor No.
65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency.	A	4
66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.	A	8
67. In my judgement, this community is a good place to raise a family.	A	8
68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.	A	7
69. My principal acts as though he is interested in me and my problems.	A	1
70. My school principal supervises rather than "snoopervises" the teachers in our school.	A	1
71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.	D	7
72. Teachers' meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.	D	1
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.	A	1
74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.	A	1
75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.	A	4
76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.	D	2
77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make my work more enjoyable.	A	3
78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.	A	2
79. The purpose and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.	D	6
80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.	A	3
81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.	D	10

	Keyed Responses	Factor No.
82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their school work.	A	2
83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.	A	2
84. Other teachers in our school are appreciative of my work.	A	3
85. As a teacher in this community, my non-professional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.	D	10
86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.	A	2
87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.	A	3
88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.	A	6
89. I really enjoy working with my students.	A	2
90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.	A	3
91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.	A	10
92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when he visits my classes.	A	1
93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher's capacity and talent.	A	1
94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.	A	8
95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.	A	1
96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.	A	8
97. This community is willing to support a good program of education.	A	8
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many activities.	D	10

	Keyed Responses	Factor No.
99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher.	D	10
100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.	A	2

APPENDIX A.2

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIREPART B

PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE SAME SHEETS AS YOU HAVE USED FOR THE OPINIONAIRE. BLACKEN THE SPACE ON THE ANSWER SHEET WHICH CORRESPONDS TO THE CATEGORY IN WHICH YOU BELONG.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>101. AGE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) under 20 (2) 20-25 (3) 26-30 (4) 31-35 (5) 36-40 (6) 41-45 (7) 46-50 (8) 51-55 (9) over 55 | <p>105. NUMBER OF YEARS OF POST-SECONDARY TRAINING:</p> <p>(for which you are credited for salary purposes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) 1 year or less (2) 2 years (3) 3 years (4) 4 years (5) 5 years (6) 6 years or more |
| <p>102. SEX:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) male (2) female | |
| <p>103. MARITAL STATUS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) single (2) married (3) other | |
| <p>104. TEACHING EXPERIENCE:</p> <p>(include this year as a full year)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) 1 year (2) 2 years (3) 3-4 years (4) 5-9 years (5) 10-19 years (6) 20 years or more | <p>106. SUBJECT AREA IN WHICH THE <u>MAJORITY</u> OF YOUR TEACHING TIME IS SPENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) math (2) science (3) social (4) English (5) French (6) physical education (7) fine arts (8) home ec. or ind. arts |

Questions 107-111 are to be answered ONLY BY TEACHERS INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING.

107. EXPERIENCE IN TEAM TEACHING:
- (include this year as a full year)
- (1) 1 year
 - (2) 2 years
 - (3) 3 years
 - (4) 4 years
 - (5) 5 years or more

108. WHAT WAS YOUR INITIAL ENTHUSIASM WHEN YOU WERE ASSIGNED TO YOUR POSITION IN A TEAM TEACHING SITUATION?
- (1) very low
 - (2) low
 - (3) moderate
 - (4) high
 - (5) very high
109. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT ENTHUSIASM TOWARD BEING INVOLVED IN A TEAM TEACHING SITUATION?
- (1) very low
 - (2) low
 - (3) moderate
 - (4) high
 - (5) very high
110. WERE YOU GIVEN THE CHOICE OF WHETHER OR NOT TO BECOME INVOLVED IN TEAM TEACHING?
- (1) yes
 - (2) no
111. FREE RESPONSE: BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE EVENTS WHICH LED UP TO YOUR APPOINTMENT IN A TEAM TEACHING SITUATION.

PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL ITEMS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. THE COMPLETION OF ALL QUESTIONS IS NECESSARY IN ORDER FOR THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO BE MEANINGFUL.

APPENDIX A.3

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

TEACHER OPINION STUDY

Directions:

- 1) Use the I.B.M. Answer Sheet for all responses except 111.
- 2) Please answer all questions (1-100 from the Teacher Opinionnaire and 101-106 from the Personal Data Sheet).
TEAM TEACHERS ONLY will answer questions 107-111.
- 3) Mark only one response for each question.
- 4) Use an HB pencil to mark your responses. It is important that your marks are no longer than the guidelines which are provided. Avoid making your marks too large or too faint. If you change a response, erase the first mark completely.
- 5) Do not put your name or any other identification on the answer sheet.
- 6) Replace the answer sheet and all other material in the envelope and return it to the school office.

The completed questionnaires will be picked up at the school after two or three days. Please make sure to return them to the office before that time.

Thank you for your willingness to cooperate in this project.

APPENDIX A.4

NAME: _____

LAST FIRST MIDDLE

OMIT YEAR OF GRADE

OMIT

DATE

OMIT

Indicate response by placing a mark between the guidelines as shown in the example. Use HB pencil. Don't make marks longer than guidelines.

Example

SCHOOL

OMIT

NUMBER

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	A	PA	PD	D	///	A	PA	PD	D	///	A	PA	PD	D	///	A	PA	PD	D	///
1.					///	26.				///	51.				///	76.				///
2.					///	27.				///	52.				///	77.				///
3.					///	28.				///	53.				///	78.				///
4.					///	29.				///	54.				///	79.				///
5.					///	30.				///	55.				///	80.				///
6.					///	31.				///	56.				///	81.				///
7.					///	32.				///	57.				///	82.				///
8.					///	33.				///	58.				///	83.				///
9.					///	34.				///	59.				///	84.				///
10.					///	35.				///	60.				///	85.				///
11.					///	36.				///	61.				///	86.				///
12.					///	37.				///	62.				///	87.				///
13.					///	38.				///	63.				///	88.				///
14.					///	39.				///	64.				///	89.				///
15.					///	40.				///	65.				///	90.				///
16.					///	41.				///	66.				///	91.				///
17.					///	42.				///	67.				///	92.				///
18.					///	43.				///	68.				///	93.				///
19.					///	44.				///	69.				///	94.				///
20.					///	45.				///	70.				///	95.				///
21.					///	46.				///	71.				///	96.				///
22.					///	47.				///	72.				///	97.				///
23.					///	48.				///	73.				///	98.				///
24.					///	49.				///	74.				///	99.				///
25.					///	50.				///	75.				///	100.				///

101.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	///
102.	1	2	////////////////////							
103.	1	2	3	////////////////////						
104.	1	2	3	4	5	6	////////////////////			
105.	1	2	3	4	5	6	////////////////////			
106.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	////////////////////	
107.	1	2	3	4	5	////////////////////				
108.	1	2	3	4	5	////////////////////				
109.	1	2	3	4	5	////////////////////				
110.	1	2	////////////////////							

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

MEAN SCORES ON 100 ITEMS OF THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE FOR
TEAM TEACHERS AND CONVENTIONAL TEACHERS

Item number	Mean scores		Level of probability (two-tail)
	Team (N=69)	Conventional (N=79)	
1.	2.55	2.29	0.150
2.	3.42	3.29	0.323
3.	3.49	2.84	0.000
4.	2.57	2.78	0.194
5.	3.10	3.25	0.337
6.	3.42	2.99	0.004
7.	3.35	3.00	0.021
8.	3.52	3.66	0.237
9.	1.84	2.43	0.001
10.	3.29	3.24	0.761
11.	3.35	3.51	0.221
12.	2.94	2.53	0.011
13.	2.49	2.54	0.754
14.	2.54	2.66	0.473
15.	2.52	2.87	0.048
16.	3.39	2.70	0.000
17.	3.57	3.05	0.000
18.	3.23	3.43	0.143
19.	3.38	3.37	0.945
20.	3.49	2.53	0.000
21.	2.78	2.61	0.336
22.	3.29	3.46	0.170
23.	3.36	3.16	0.091
24.	2.87	2.97	0.471
25.	2.72	2.33	0.006
26.	3.33	3.20	0.375
27.	3.03	3.09	0.725
28.	3.48	3.53	0.651
29.	2.86	2.99	0.423
30.	2.99	3.20	0.192
31.	3.39	3.35	0.813
32.	2.48	2.70	0.159
33.	3.09	2.95	0.357
34.	2.91	3.16	0.078
35.	2.57	2.41	0.285
36.	2.33	2.56	0.154
37.	3.20	3.20	0.999
38.	3.49	3.35	0.268
39.	2.58	2.81	0.171
40.	3.62	3.41	0.092
41.	3.23	2.94	0.038
42.	3.48	3.41	0.625
43.	3.12	2.95	0.272
44.	3.33	2.97	0.013

Item number	Mean scores		Level of probability (two-tail)
	Team (N=69)	Conventional (N=79)	
45.	2.94	3.28	0.021
46.	3.48	3.41	0.517
47.	3.23	3.14	0.521
48.	3.67	3.70	0.739
49.	3.64	2.84	0.000
50.	3.41	3.37	0.746
51.	3.13	3.10	0.833
52.	3.57	3.58	0.860
53.	3.57	3.47	0.278
54.	2.88	2.96	0.624
55.	3.39	3.47	0.459
56.	3.38	3.61	0.072
57.	2.97	2.47	0.004
58.	3.45	3.44	0.950
59.	2.91	2.62	0.102
60.	3.06	3.20	0.355
61.	3.26	3.04	0.125
62.	3.26	3.20	0.720
63.	2.61	2.81	0.218
64.	2.67	2.77	0.541
65.	1.71	1.76	0.733
66.	2.99	2.72	0.088
67.	3.20	3.01	0.174
68.	2.94	2.72	0.114
69.	3.30	3.29	0.924
70.	3.51	3.37	0.305
71.	3.26	3.00	0.040
72.	3.26	2.99	0.092
73.	3.33	3.34	0.947
74.	3.39	3.48	0.452
75.	3.36	3.46	0.485
76.	3.45	3.68	0.034
77.	3.41	3.35	0.672
78.	3.45	3.41	0.676
79.	2.67	2.35	0.048
80.	3.10	3.14	0.770
81.	3.23	3.49	0.029
82.	3.26	3.10	0.183
83.	2.84	3.04	0.242
84.	3.13	3.16	0.748
85.	3.30	3.59	0.029
86.	3.57	3.67	0.304
87.	3.26	3.09	0.121
88.	2.99	2.71	0.021
89.	3.51	3.38	0.244
90.	3.35	2.94	0.001
91.	3.45	3.10	0.007

B29919